

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री प्रशासन अकादमी

Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy

of Administration

मसूरी

MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय

LIBRARY

अवधि संख्या

Accession No.....

~~7797~~ 1157 69

वर्ग संख्या

Class No.....

954.02

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No.....

Maz





**SOCIO-ECONOMIC HISTORY OF  
NORTHERN INDIA (1030-1194 A.D.)**

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC HISTORY OF  
NORTHERN INDIA**

**(1030-1194 A.D.)**

By

**BHAKAT PRASAD MAZUMDAR M.A., PH.D**

**Head of the Department of History, B. N. College,  
Patna University, Patna.**



**Firma K. L. MUKHOPADHYAY  
CALCUTTA 1960**

© First Edition 1960

Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, Publishers,  
6/1A, Banchharam Akrur Lane, Calcutta-12

Price Rs. 20'00

Printed by J. C. Sarkhel at the Calcutta Oriental Press  
Private Ltd., 9, Panchanan Ghosh Lane, Calcutta 9

To  
my father  
Dr. BIMANBEHARI MAJUMDAR, M.A., Ph.D.,  
*Premchand Roychand Scholar, Bhagavataratna*

**Thesis approved for the degree of Doctor  
of Philosophy in the University of Patna.**

## PREFACE

The book seeks to interpret the working of the social and economic forces which shaped the political destiny of Northern India in the period between the death of Sultān Mahmūd of Ghaznī (1030 A.D.) and the final conquest of Ajmer by Qutb-ud-din Aibak from Harirāja, the brother of Prithvirāja III (1194 A.D.). The pathetic indifference of the people to the paramount problem of defending their country against the devastating raids and invasions of the Turko-Afghans during the period of one hundred and sixty-four years has puzzled many. The present work attempts to find out whether the cause of apparent apathy towards the building up of an organisation of a quasi-permanent nature in order to offer united resistance to the invaders actually lies in the socio-economic factors.

The materials for the study of these factors are not inconsiderable in volume. These can be found in the contemporary *nibandhas* or digests, literary and semi-historical works, books on *nīti* or politics, *kośa* or lexicon, technical works like *Yuktikalpataru* and *Samarāṅgaṇasāstradhāra* and above all, in the voluminous body of inscriptions. A comparative study of the indigenous materials and the accounts of foreign writers yield fruitful results. Alberuni's work has been known to scholars as a veritable mine of information; but the accounts left by his pupil Gardizī are not equally well-known, because some portions of it are still preserved in manuscript in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. I secured a photostat of the relevant portions for my work.

The most important of the digests is the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, written by Lakṣmīdhara, at first Justice and later on the Minister of Peace and War of King Govindachandra Gāhadvāla (c. 1114-1154 A.D.). Prof. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar thinks that the work was compiled in the early part of the

reign of Govindachandra. It is a voluminous work in fourteen *kāṇḍas*, of which eleven, namely, *Brahmachāri*, *Gṛihastha*, *Suddhi*, *Niyatakāla*, *Tīrthavivechana*, *Śrāddha*, *Dāna*, *Vrata*, *Vyavahāra*, *Mokṣa*, and *Rājadharmā kāṇḍas* have been published in eleven big tomes. As its publication continued from 1941 to 1953 A.D., no student of history, to the best of my knowledge, has as yet tried to utilize the valuable materials it contains with a view to reconstructing the social and economic history of India of the twelfth century A.D. Many of the statements of Lakṣmīdhara can be checked up with the help of the *Mitākṣarā* of Vijñāneśvara, and the *Kālaviveka*, *Dāyabhāga* and *Vyavahāramūrtikā* of Jimutavāhana. All these works were written in the first half of the twelfth century A.D. An earlier work is the *Rājamūrtanḍa* of Bhoja, probably the same as the famous King of the Paramāra dynasty (c. 1000-1055 A.D.). *Dānasāgara* and *Adbhutasāgara*, ascribed to Vallālasena and *Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva*, written by Halāyudha, the Chief Justice in the reign of Lakṣmaṇasena, also furnish us with some valuable data. These can be compared profitably with the works of Aparārka (c. 1125 A.D.) and Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa whose *Smṛitichandrikā* was compiled sometime between 1150 and 1225 A.D. Whether some of the practices and institutions referred to in the digests of the twelfth century A.D. continued in later times can be ascertained by consulting the *Gṛihastharatnākara* and *Rājanītiratnākara* of Chaṇḍeśvara (c. 1290-1370 A.D.) of Mithilā, *Haribhaktivilāsa* of Gopālabhaṭṭa (early sixteenth century) and the *Vīramītrodaya* (1615-1645 A.D.). We have quoted epigraphic and literary evidence supporting many of the statements of the digests.

The information supplied by *smṛiti* works can be usefully supplemented by facts gleaned from the *nīti* works. Besides the *Rājadharmakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara, *Nītikalpataru* of Kṣemendra, a contemporary of King Ananta of Kashmir (1028-1063 A.D.), which had been published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in 1956 and *Laghvarhannīti*-

*śāstra*, written by the famous Jaina scholar Hemachandra, can definitely be ascribed to the period under review. Thomas has ascribed the *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra* to the twelfth century A.D. Somadeva's *Nītivākyāmṛita*, though written in c. 951 A.D. and the *Rājanītiratnākara* of Chaṇḍeśvara, written early in the fourteenth century A.D., may be taken to reflect conditions which prevailed also in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. This is also the case with the startlingly original book, *Śukranītisāra*. It is known from Kautīlya's *Arthaśāstra* that there was an old school of political thought represented by Śukra, Uśanas or Bhārgava. Chaṇḍeśvara quotes verses from *Śukranīti* in as many as four places (f. n. of Jayaswal's edition of *Rājanītiratnākara*, Chapter XI. Pp. 42, 70, 72, 76-77) but none of these verses occur in the edition of Oppert or of Jivananda Vidyasagara. The *Nītikalpataru* of Kṣemendra however, quotes ten verses from the work of Bhārgava, which have been traced to the printed edition of *Śukranītisāra*, though in some cases the lines interchange their positions in the *Śukranītisāra*.\* The citation of so many verses by an author who wrote in the middle of the eleventh century may be taken as a positive proof of the existence of the *Śukranītisāra* in some form or other in the eleventh century A.D. There have been some interpolations no doubt, for example, passages relating to fire-arms. But such instances of interpolation are not rare in medieval works. We have, therefore, drawn rather extensively from the *Śukranītisāra*.

*Yuktikalpataru* and *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*, both attributed to Bhoja of the eleventh century A.D. and *Mānasollāsa* written by Someśvara (c. 1127-38 A.D.) constitute a class by themselves and throw important light on feudalism, military organisation, manners and customs and above all, on some of the important industries of the time.

\* *Nītikalpataru*, section 98 verses 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60 and 61 = *Śukranītisāra* IV, 7, 133, 134-135, 129, 130-131, 132, 124, 125, 126 and 127 respectively.



No other epoch of the Hindu age is so rich in historical and semi-historical writings as the period under our survey. *Rāmācharita* of Sandhyākaranandī, written in the reign of Madanapāla (c. 1144-1161 A.D.) of the Pāla dynasty, *Vikramāṅkadevācharita* of Bilhaṇa, composed before 1088 A.D., the masterly history of Kashmir by Kalhana completed in 1159-1160 A.D. and the *Dvyāśrayakāvya* or *Kumārāpālācharita*, written by Hemachandra in the latter half of the twelfth century A.D., are rich mines of information relating to social and economic life of the people.

We have also pressed into service poetical works like *Naiṣadha-charita* of Śrīharsa, who most probably flourished under Vijayachandra and Jayachandra of Kanauj, *Prabodha-chandrodaya* of Kṛṣṇamiśra, written at the command of Gopāla, the chief of the vassals of Kirttivarman (1098 A.D.), *Samaya-mātrikā*, *Kalāvīlāsa*, *Bodhisattvavadāna-kalpalatā*, *Lokapra-kāśa*, and *Daśāvatara-charita* of Kṣemendra as also *Gīta-govinda* of Jayadeva and the works of his contemporaries like Dhoyī, the author of *Pavanādūta*, Govardhana, the author of *Āryāṣaptasatī* and the poems contained in the *Saduktikarṇāmrita* compiled by Śrīdharadāsa on the 11th February, 1206 A.D. The information contained in the *Char-yāpadas*, *Udayasundarikathā* of Sodḍhala (composed sometime between 1026 and 1050 A.D.), *Triṣaṣṭīśalākā-puruṣa-charita* of Hemachandra, *Prīthvīrājaraśo* of Chānd Baradāyī, *Prīthvīrājaviṣaya* (commented by Jonarāja) written sometime between 1178 and 1200 A.D., *Hamvīramadamardana*, written in the thirteenth century A.D., *Yasastilakachampū*, written by Somadeva in Śaka 881/c. 959 A.D. has also been drawn upon.

The information gathered from literary works and digests has been corroborated and supplemented by epigraphic records, wherever available. These evidences culled together reveal to us a feudal society, characterised by social and political disintegration, economic stagnation, moral bankruptcy and a pathetic dependence on stars and omens.

The author craves the indulgence of the readers for certain misprints, broken types and errors in diacritical marks like *Thakkura* for *Thakkura*, *Brahmana* for *Brāhmaṇa* which crept into the text.

To the great regret of the author, this volume could not be printed during the life-time of Sri Baldeva Sahay, ex-Advocate-General of Bihar, who first infused into him the desire to carry on researches in Indian history. No less is the debt of gratitude to two other notable Indologists, Dr. A. S. Altekar and Dr. T. P. Chowdhury, of the Patna University, who passed away last year. They made many constructive criticisms.

The book owes much to a number of other scholars. Among them Dr. J. N. Banerjee, formerly Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Dr. D. C. Sircar, Epigraphist to the Government of India, Dr. Iqbal Hussain, Principal, Patna College, Prof. S. N. Bhattacharyya, formerly Professor of Sanskrit, B. N. College, Patna, Prof. S. H. Askari of the Department of History, Patna University, Prof. A. Khair, Head of the Department of Persian, B. N. College, Patna, Dr. T. P. Bhattacharyya, former Head of the Department of History, B. N. College, Patna, Mr. Q. Ahmed, Research Scholar, K.P.J. Research Institute, Patna, Prof. S. K. Dutta, former Principal, R. D. & D. J. College, Monghyr and Prof. Bhagaban Prasad Majumdar of the Department of English, B. N. College, Patna, made valuable suggestions. No words can express the author's sense of gratitude to his teacher Dr. K. K. Datta, Director, K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna, for his encouragement, criticisms and guidance. Thanks are also due to Mr. Samar C. Dutt for help and suggestions.



## ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI	...	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
AIOC	...	Proceedings and transactions of the All-India Oriental Conference.
AR	...	Rāshtrakūṭas and their Times by A.S. Altekar.
ASC	...	Archaeological Survey of India. Reports by Sir A. Cunningham.
ASI	...	Archaeological Survey of India (Annual Report).
ASS	...	Anandasrama Sanskrit Series, Poona.
BG	...	Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I.
Bh. List.	...	A List of Inscriptions of Northern India by D. R. Bhandarkar (Appendix to El. XIX-XXIII).
BI.	...	Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta.
Brahmachāri		Brahmachārikāṇḍa section of Kṛtyakalpataru (GOS, VOL. No. CVI).
Briggs	...	Ta'rikh-i-Firishta, translation in English by Briggs.
BSS	...	Bombay Sanskrit (and Prakrit) Series, Bombay (and Poona).
CC	...	Chaturvarga-chintāmaṇi of Hemādri, Vol. II. (Vrata-Khaṇḍa), published by Bibliotheca Indica.
CII	...	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.
CP	...	Copper-plate.
Dānakāṇḍa	...	Dānakāṇḍa section of Kṛtyakalpataru (GOS. Vol. XCII).
DHNI	...	Dynastic History of Northern India by H. C. Ray in 2 volumes, Calcutta 1931 & 1936.
DV	...	Dvyāśrayakāvya of Hemachandra.
EI	...	Epigraphia Indica.

- Gardizi ... Ouseley Ms. 240, pages Nos. 213B-220B and 246B-262B, photostat copy from Bodleian Library.
- GOS ... Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda.
- Grihastha ... Gṛihasthakāṇḍa section of the Kṛtyakalpataṛu, (GOS. Vol. No. CI)
- HB ... History of Bengal, Vol. 1 edited by R. C. Majumdar, Dacca, May 1943.
- HDS ... History of Dharmaśāstra by P. V. Kane, in 5 vols. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- HIED ... History of India as told by its own Historians, by H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson.
- HIG ... Historical Inscriptions of Gujarat by G. V. Acharya, Bombay.
- IA ... Indian Antiquary, Bombay.
- IB ... Inscriptions of Bengal, Vol. III. by N. G. Majumdar.
- IC ... Indian Culture, Calcutta.
- IHQ ... Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
- JAHRS ... Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society, Rajamundry.
- JAOS ... Journal of the American Oriental Society, New Haven.
- JASB ... Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
- JBBRAS ... Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay.
- JBORS ... Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna.
- JBRs ... Journal of the Bihar Research Society, Patna.
- JDL ... Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta.
- JNSI ... Journal of the Numismatic Society of India, Bombay.
- J. Or. RI. ... Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.

JOHRS	...	Journal of the Orissa Historical Research Society.
JRAS	...	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London.
JRASB	...	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, (Letters), Calcutta.
JUPHS	...	Journal of the U. P. Historical Society.
KE	...	Kalachuri Era
KM	...	Kāvyamālā, NSP., Bombay.
KV	...	Kālaviveka of Jīmūtavāhana (Bibliotheca Indica).
LP	...	Lekhāpaddhati.
MASI	...	Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India.
Niyata.	...	Niyatakālakāṇḍa section of the Kṛtyakalpataru, (GOS. Vol. No. CXI)
NSP.	...	Nirṇaya-Sāgara Press
PHAI	...	Political History of Ancient India, by H. C. Raychaudhuri, Calcutta.
PIHC	...	Proceedings of the Indian History Congress.
PO	...	Poona Orientalist, Poona.
PRAS. WC	...	Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle.
Rāj.	...	Rājadharmakāṇḍa section of the Kṛtyakalpataru, (GOS. Vol. No. C)
RC.	...	Rāmācharita, edited by R. C. Majumdar, R. G. Basak and N. G. Banerji, Rajshahi.
RLARBP.	...	Revised List of Antiquarian Remains of Bombay Presidency.
RT.	...	Rājatarāṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa, translated by M. A. Stein.
SBE.	...	Sacred Books of the East, Oxford.
Sachau	...	Alberuni's India, edited with notes and Indices by E. C. Sachau, two volumes in one (popular edition), London.

- Sadukti. ... Saduktikarṇāmṛita of Śrīdharadāsa, edited by Ramavatara Sarma, H. D. Sharma, published by Motilal Banarsi Dass, Lahore, 1933.
- SI. ... Stone Inscription.
- Sm. C. ... Smṛiti-chandrikā of Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa.
- ŚP ... Śārṅgadhara-paddhati, edited by P. Peterson.
- SS ... Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra, edited by T. Ganapati Shastri (GOS. Vol. Nos. XXV and XXXII).
- Tirthavive-  
chana. ... Tirthavivechanakāṇḍa section of the Kṛitya-kalpataru (GOS. Vol. No. XCVIII).
- Vaij. ... Vaijayantī of Yādavaprakāśa.
- VRS. ... Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi.
- Yāj. ... Yājñavalkya-smṛiti.

## CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	... ..	ix
<i>Abbreviations</i>	... ..	xv
Chapter I		
<i>Feudalism</i>	... ..	1-41
<p>Incessant wars increased the power of the feudatories, 1 ; effects of distant raids, 2 ; change of overlordship, 3 ; wars of succession, 4 ; lack of centralised administration, 5 ; origin of feudalism, 5 ; its development, 9 ; hey-day of feudalism in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D., 11 ; increase in the number of feudatories, 13 ; causes of increase of power of feudatories, 18 ; legal status of King and feudatories, 19 ; grades of vassals, 21 ; obligations of vassals, 25 ; sub-infeudation, 28 ; disservices of feudalism, 28 ; contrast between European and Indian feudalism, 33 ; Indian princes could not rally the common people under their banner, 34.</p>		
Chapter II		
<i>The Military System and its Effects</i>	...	42-76
<p>Hereditary army and feudalism, 42 ; Brāhmaṇas and military profession, 43 ; types of troops, 44 ; dress and habits of soldiers, 48 ; constituents of the army, 50 ; horses and elephants, 50-51 ; chariot, 53 ; navy, 53 ; strength, 55 ; expenditure on army, 56 ; offensive weapons, 58 ; fire-arms, 59 ; expeditions, 60 ; causes of defeat of Pṛithvīrāja III, 66-67.</p>		



## Chapter III

### *Castes and Professions* ... 77-124

Professions not based on castes. 77 : rigidity of caste system, 78 : categories of Brāhmaṇas. 79 : variety of professions. 84 : influence of Brahmanas. 89 : hunger-strike. 90 : division according to habitat. 93 : position of Kṣatriyas. 94 : Vaiśyas. 96 : Kāyasthas as a caste. 98 : Vaidyas. 105 : Śādras. 106 : the Harijans. 111.

## Chapter IV

### *The Turkish Settlers and effects of social contact with them* ... 125-134

Foreigners in Indian population. 125 : *Turṅkatānda*. 126 : tolerance shown to the Turks. 128 : *Sūfi* saints. 128 : beef-eating. 130 : *Suddhi*. 131.

## Chapter V

### *Position of Women in Society* ... 135-144

Women as dependents. 135 : respect for women. 135 : improvement in the position of women. 136 : queens. 137 : political activity of women. 139 : their education. 139 : *purdah* system. 141.

## Chapter VI

### *The Educational System* ... 145-169

General and technical education. 145 : status of *Upavedas* for medicine, military science and public administration. 146 : the *kalās*. 147 : primary education. 149 : courses of study. 149 : teacher-pupil relationship. 152 : monastic establishments. 153 : scholarly acti-

vities in monasteries. 155; Hindu *mathas*, 156; economic condition of teachers, 160; effects of Turko-Afghan raids. 163.

## Chapter VII

### *Land and its Cultivation* . . . . . 170-182

Effects of Sultan Mahmūd's raids on agriculture, 170; effects of frequent warfare, 171; land as a social trust, 171; irrigation projects and tanks, 172; assessment of land revenue, 174; agricultural products, 177.

## Chapter VIII

### *Labour* . . . . . 183-191

Guilds, 183; State as employer, 183; private employers, 184; wages, 185; slavery, 186; forced labour, 188.

## Chapter IX

### *Industries and their Organisation* . . . . . 192-214

Metallie industries, 192; textiles, 193; dress of the rich and poor, 194; umbrellas, 195; sugar, 196; iron and steel, 197; crucibles, 198; swords, 198; copper industry, 201; glass industry, 203; mirrors, 203; tanning industry, 204; boat-making, 204; wooden furniture, 207; soap and soap-nuts, 207; ornaments, 208; organisation of guilds, 209.

## Chapter X

### *Currency, Banking and Usury* . . . . . 215-227

Currency system adversely affected, 215; gold coins, 215; standard of money, 216; table of coins, 218; *cowries*, 218; medium of large transactions, 219; relative value of gold and silver, 220; banking, 220; merchant banking, 222; *hundies*, 223; usury, 225.

## Chapter XI

*Public Finance* ... .. 228-244

King's part, 228 ; land revenue, 228 ; *śulka*, 230 ; excise duty, 233 ; octroi, 233 ; road cess, 234 ; sales tax, 234 ; escheat, 235 ; tithes, 235 ; new taxes, 236 ; welfare functions, 239.

## Chapter XII

*Daily Life of the People* ... .. 245-273

Insecurity on account of wars, 245 ; cities, 246 ; city life, 248 ; village life, 250 ; amusements, 251 ; dramatic performances, 252 ; dancing, 254 ; games, 254 ; food and drink, 257 ; forbidden vegetarian food, 258 ; fish, 258 ; meat, 259 ; wine, 260 ; alms-houses, 262 ; inns, 263 ; poverty, 264 ; fatalism and astrology, 265.

## Chapter XIII

*Festivals* ... .. 274-315

Festive India, 274 ; in *Chaitra*, 274 ; *Holi*, 276 ; *Vasanta* festival, 277 ; in *Vaiśākha*, 279 ; in *Jyaiṣṭha*, 281 ; in *Āṣāḍha*, 282 ; in *Śrāvaṇa*, 284 ; in *Bhādra*, 284 ; a political festival, 287 ; in *Āśvin*, 290 ; *Durgā-pūja*, 291 ; in *Kārtika*, 294 ; in *Agrahāyaṇa*, 297 ; in *Pauṣa*, 299 ; in *Māgha*, 299 ; in *Phālguna*, 301 ; a comparative account of early mediaeval and modern festivals, 305 ; too many festivals distracted the attention of the people, 307.

## Chapter XIV

*Tīrthas or Places of Pilgrimage* .. 316-354

Unifying influence of *tīrthas*, 316 ; pro-

tection of holy places, 317; Purī, 319; the twelve *Jyotirlingas*, 319; sources of our knowledge about *tīrthas*, 320; *tīrthas* in Varendrī, 327; in Kashmīr, 328; some famous holy places, 332; effect of Sultān Mahmud's invasion on *tīrthas*, 334, 335, 338; Vaiṣṇava *tīrthas*, 336, 344; Banaras, 339; Prayāg, 341; Gayā, 342; *Śākta pīṭhas* 346; hardship of pilgrims, 349.

## Chapter XV

### *Standard of Morality* ... 355-386

Changing standard. 355; conduct of kings, 356; immoral life of kings. 357; drinking of wine, 359; suicide. 361; bribery and corruption, 366; quacks, 367; dishonesty of merchants, 369; prostitution, 370; *deva-dāsīs*, 371; saturnalian festivals, 373; adultery, 378; moral standard of poets, 378; ethical standard in sculpture, 380.

Bibliography ... 387

Index ... 402



## CHAPTER I

### Feudalism

The collapse of the Gurjara-Pratihāra empire ushered in the age of feudal disintegration in Northern India. Families, which had been faithful vassals of the Gurjara-Pratihāra emperors for generations, threw off their allegiance to their overlord in the tenth century A.D. Thus the Chandellas or Chandrātreyas of Jejākabhukti, the Kalachuris of Tripurī and of Sarayūpāra, the Guhilas and the Chāhamānas, asserted their independence and began to fight interminable battles amongst themselves. They themselves had to depend, to a considerable extent, upon those vassals, who transferred their allegiance to them or those who aspired for important fiefs in recognition of their faithful service. The feudatories welcomed the ambitious designs of an energetic King, because, they had to be appeased with land and wealth before they could be induced to go out on an expedition. Thus Someśvara Chālukya of Kalyāṇa in his *Mānasollāsa*<sup>1</sup> says, that, on the day preceding the date of starting out on an expedition, the King should convene an assembly of Princes, feudatories, rulers of *maṇḍalas* and soldiers and satisfy them with presents of gold, dresses and ornaments and encourage them by singing their praises. Another mediaeval work on Politics, the *Śukranītisāra*,<sup>2</sup> lays down the maxim that a King would be well advised to make peace with his own feudatories before going out to conquer his enemies. Sandhyākaranandī<sup>3</sup> also describes how Rāmapāla of Bengal conciliated his feudatories before undertaking the war against Bhīma Kaivarta: "by that King (Rāmapāla) that (body of *Sāmantas*), who attained great strength by possession of cavalry, elephants and infantry was gained over (i.e. made favourable) by

presents of land and enormous wealth." Brihaspati<sup>4</sup> also advises a king to welcome feudatories as if they were himself, with viands, clothing etc.

As war was a passion with the kings of this age, the feudatories went on increasing their power. Succession of weak kings afforded them a suitable opportunity for extending their power still further. A war of succession, which was not infrequent in this period, was eagerly awaited by them, because, on such an occasion both the contestants for power tried to win them over by gifts.

Another factor responsible for the increase in the number, if not in the power, of feudal chieftains was the devastating raids by rulers of distant territories over vast stretches of land in Northern India. Rājendra Choḷa I raided Eastern India (c. 1021 A.D.). His raid was thus almost simultaneous with that of Sultān Mahmūd of Ghaznī. The mantle of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas fell on Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa and, like Govinda III, Kṛṣṇa III and Indra III, Vikramāditya VI and Someśvara III, they made rapid conquests of distant parts of Northern and Eastern India. Eastern India was raided by the Kalachuri Kings, Karṇa and Yaśaḥ Karṇa, Anantavarman Choḍagaṅga and the Gāhaḍavāla ruler, Govindachandra. Such raids weakened and sometimes sapped the vitality of the reigning dynasty in the invaded country. The feudal chieftains, who were loyal enough to rally round the banner of their overlord for resisting the invaders, received or seized handsome rewards after the raid. The smaller chieftains, manifested signs of independence in the days of weakness of the overlord. Moreover, the invader sometimes set up new feudal chieftainship in the raided country by endowing some of his trusted lieutenants with fiefs out of the conquered territory. We can account for the existence of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Mahāṇa or Mathana in Aṅga, Karṇāṭa Nānyadeva in Mithila and Vijayasena in Rāḍhā in this way. As it was not often possible for the successors of the raiding monarch to exercise any effective control over such distant fiefs, these feuda-

tories assumed semi-independence and in course of time, complete independence.

Frequent change of overlordship was another characteristic feature of the age. In no other period of Indian history did large tracts of country pass so rapidly from one dynasty to another. The one hundred and sixty four years, between 1030 and 1194 A. D., witnessed kaleidoscopic changes in the frontiers of kingdoms. Thus Aṅga was conquered from the Pālas by the Kalachuri King Gāṅgeyadeva in about 1034 A.D.. His son, Karṇa (c. 1041-1070 A. D. ) invaded Magadha and appointed Jātavarman to rule over Aṅga as his agent or vassal. In 1124 A. D. we find Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla (c. 1114-1154 A. D. ) ruling over Maner, which is at a distance of only 14 miles from Patna. Dr. D. C. Sircar has proved that the Pāla ruler Madanapāla (c. 1144-1161 A. D. ) ruled over the Patna district in the third year of his reign, which falls in 1146<sup>5</sup> A. D.. In the same year, however, Govindachandra is known to have been in possession of Monghyr<sup>6</sup> Madanapāla of the Pāla dynasty must have succeeded in reconquering Monghyr by 1157 A. D.<sup>7</sup> His successor, Govindapāla held sway over the Patna-Gaya region in 1164 A. D.. But within a few years, that is, before 1175 A. D., the Gāhaḍavālas again succeeded in driving out the Pālas from West Bihar. A portion of Bhagalpore, however, in East Bihar, passed temporarily into the hands of Vallālasena about 1166 A. D.. It was recovered by the Pāla ruler Palapāla, who continued to rule over East Bihar till the end of the twelfth century.<sup>8</sup> The misfortune of being transferred from one dynasty to another in quick succession was not peculiar to the history of Bihar alone. Banaras and the Gaṅgā-Yamunā Doāb were conquered by the Kalachuris from the Chandellas<sup>9</sup> in the second quarter of the eleventh century. But the Kalachuris lost control over these areas sometime before the accession of Yaśaḥ Karṇa (c. 1073 A. D. ). Probably it passed into the hands of the Chandella ruler Sallakṣaṇavarman<sup>10</sup> from whom it was conquered by Chandradeva



Gāhaḍavāla in about 1090 A. D.. Yaśaḥ Karṇa is known to have reconquered it in 1122-23 A. D., but in 1124 A. D. Govindachandra finally brought it under his rule. Such rapid changes in the mastery over territories must have made the smaller feudal chieftains very important. A new conqueror could not have uprooted all the petty feudal chiefs, in whose hands, the actual administration of the country, especially in the interior, lay. He had, very often, to yield place to another conqueror, before he could consolidate his power and authority in the newly conquered area.

It is worth noticing in this connection that in this period there is hardly any instance of two consecutive generations of brilliant monarchs with record of unbroken success in any dynasty excepting the Chaulukyas of Gujarat. But the latter were troubled with wars of succession, which encouraged the feudatories to strengthen their power. Besides the Gujarat rulers, the most outstanding monarchs of this period in Northern India, were Bhoja Paramāra (c. 1000-55 A. D.), Chandella Vidyādhara (c. 1019-50 A. D.), Kalachuri Gāṅgeyadeva (c. 1019-41 A. D.) and his son Karṇa (c. 1041-70 A. D.). Gāhaḍavāla Govindachandra (c. 1114-54 A. D.) and Chāhamāna Prithvirāja III (c. 1177-92 A. D.). Bhoja Paramāra had to devote much of his time and energy to repairing the fortunes of his dynasty, which had suffered eclipse at the sudden death of Muñja, yet, he was able to lead successful expeditions against the Chāhamānas of Nāḍol,<sup>11</sup> the ruler of Chambā<sup>12</sup> and Gāṅgeyadeva<sup>13</sup> and to occupy temporarily Kanauj, Chitor and Dubkund.<sup>14</sup> He was, however, overcome by the combined powers of the Chālukya king Somśvara I and Kalachuri King Karṇa. Arjuna, a feudatory of Vidyādhara, the Chandella monarch, slew the Gurjara-Pratihāra King Rājyapāla, for the latter's ignominious flights from the invading army of Sultān Mahmūd, but he himself could not build up any lasting confederacy capable of undertaking any offensive war against the Yamīnī dynasty at Lahore or Multan. On the other hand, he frittered away the re-

sources of the state in fighting against the Kalachuris. His successors were not strong enough to withstand the attacks of Karṇa,<sup>15</sup> who was able to build up a short-lived empire extending from the sources of Baras and Mahī rivers in the west to the Hoogli river in the east, and from the Doāb to the upper waters of the Mahānadī, Waingāṅgā, Wardhā and Tāptī. The rulers of Guḍa, Chola, Kuṅga, Hūṇa, Gurjara and Kira territories are said to have waited upon him<sup>16</sup>. But towards the close of his career, he suffered severe defeat at the hands of Chaulukya Bhīma I<sup>17</sup>, Chandella Kīrttivarman<sup>18</sup>, Paramāra Udayāditya and Vigrahapāla of the Pāla dynasty<sup>19</sup>. His successor, Yaśaḥ Karṇa had to face a life-and-death struggle against the Gāhaḍavālas over the possession of the Uttar Pradesh and lost much of his territories to Chandra-deva and Govindachandra. The misfortune of the Gāhaḍavālas, however, was that they failed to produce any worthy successor of Govindachandra. They failed, therefore, to provide that strong centralised administration which could harness the energies of feudatories to build up a strong resistance to the inroads of the Turko-Afghans.

### *Origin of feudalism :*

In order to understand the role and significance of feudalism in this period, it is necessary to review very briefly the background of the evolution of this institution in India. Feudal institutions are apt to be evolved in a state which lacks an efficient system of centralised government, and is also wanting in facilities for transport and communication. The minimum standard of safety to life and property can be ensured in the interior of such a state by entrusting the function of administering civil and criminal justice to such influential persons as would be able to command obedience in the local community. They would raise or maintain their own army, collect taxes or customary dues, pay tributes and rally round the standard of their overlord with their military contingents, when called for. The germ of such a system is

traceable in the ancient Indian custom of placing a scion of the royal family of the conquered country on its throne as a subordinate ruler by the conqueror. Kauṭilya enjoins upon the conqueror not to covet the land, things, sons and wives of the King slain by him, but to reinstate in their proper places the relatives of the King slain and to install the son of the deceased on the throne of his father.<sup>20</sup> The Śāntiparva of the Mahābhārata lays down that the conqueror should place on the throne of a conquered country, the brother, son or grandson of the defeated King and, in case none of these are available, a daughter of the late King should be crowned<sup>21</sup>. Manu,<sup>22</sup> Viṣṇudharmasūtra<sup>23</sup> and Agni Purāṇa<sup>24</sup> also prescribe that the conqueror should install some kinsman of the slain King on the throne of the defeated country.

Installation of such a person as ruler was sure to cause friction in course of time. He and his successors were constantly on the look out for opportunities for throwing off allegiance. Later writers on Indian polity, therefore, hold that normally the whole or major portion of the conquered area should be directly annexed to the kingdom of the conqueror. Thus Medhātithi, commenting on Manu VII. 201-202, writes that the conqueror should, first of all, remit some of the burdensome taxes for one or two years; then, he should proclaim to the people of the city and the villages that what they had done by virtue of their loyalty to their former master had been forgiven. "If even after the bestowing of such favours", continues Medhātithi, "he finds that the citizens and the people are still so loyal to their former master that they still cherish feelings of attachment towards his dynasty, and that any Government of his own would not be lasting, then he shall do as follows", that is, install a person of the last ruling family. Śukranīṭisāra advises the conqueror merely to support the son and queen of the vanquished King or in case they are endowed with good qualities to hand them over one-fourth of the Kingdom and in case they are not so endowed, to give them only 1/32nd part of

it<sup>25</sup>. While Manu speaks simply of a treaty between the conqueror and the scion of the vanquished King, Medhātithi draws up the following stringent terms of the treaty: "You and I shall have equal shares in your income; you shall consult me in all that you do or not do; at the proper time you shall come and help me with your treasury and force"<sup>26</sup>. It may be noticed here that the conditions suggested above are much more stringent than those which were imposed under the terms of Wellesley's Subsidiary Alliance. The successor of the vanquished King sank to the position of a vassal and was under four types of obligations to his overlord; (a) to pay a regular tribute amounting to one-half of his annual revenue, (b) to take the overlord's permission in all matters of importance, specially with regard to army and foreign policy, (c) to pay special contribution at the time of war and other necessities of the State and (d) to help the overlord with military force.

It is worth noticing here that the type of feudatory mentioned above is one of the four kinds of *mitra* or ally mentioned in the Śāntiparva, namely, one who comes for protection or security.<sup>27</sup> There is a good deal of resemblance in the position of such a feudatory with the weak king of Kauṭilya,<sup>28</sup> who being attacked by a powerful king submits to the latter and sues for peace on condition of offering his army, treasury and his territory which are respectively called Daṇḍopanata, Koṣopanata and Deśopanata. Those who make peace on condition of supplying army themselves may lead it or through the princes or Commanders-in-Chief or some indefinite person to some place mentioned by the superior king.

Another germ of feudalism may be found in the practice of making payment to officers with assignment of land. Thus the Mahābhārata<sup>29</sup> states—"the lord of 100 villages shall enjoy one village, which is large, prosperous and well-populated. The lord of 1000 villages enjoys a *Śākhā-nagara*, a sub-city." Manu<sup>30</sup> lays down—"the lord of 10 villages shall enjoy one *Kula* and the lord of 20 villages, twenty *Kulas*; the lord of

100 villages, one whole village and the lord of 1000 villages, one town." Kauṭilya prescribes payment in cash to most of the officers. But some of the superintendents, accountants, Gopas and Sthānikas, Veterinary surgeons, physicians etc., were endowed with lands, but they had no right to alienate these by sale or mortgage<sup>31</sup>.

The Maurya system of administration was so centralised, efficient and well organised that feudalism as a political system could hardly raise its head either in the Maurya or even in the Śuṅga period. Feudalism and feudatories came to occupy some prominence for the first time during the Gupta period. Samudra Gupta's policy of not annexing the territories of defeated kings of distant regions and re-establishing the royal families, which had lost their kingdoms, must have created a number of feudatories. Chandra Gupta II must have found it more convenient to administer his vast empire with the help of feudal vassals. His feudatories were Mahārāja Trikamāla, Svāmīdāsa of Central India and Mahārāja Viśvāmitrasvāmī<sup>32</sup> and also Mahārāja Sanakānika. The invasion of the Puṣyamitras and the Hūṇas were probably responsible for an increase in the number and importance of feudatories. In the later Gupta period, we find several feudal families ruling for generations. Thus Jayavarman, Siṃhavarman, Naravarman (404 A.D.) and Viśvavarman (423 A.D.) are known to have ruled at Daśapura. Similar was the case with the Maukharis who ruled over South Bihar and Eastern U. P. as feudatories of the Guptas. These feudatories became independent with the decline of the Gupta power and thus caused the disintegration of the Gupta empire. Sometime between 530 and 540 A. D., Yaśodharman, belonging to the feudatory Aulikara family of Western Malwa, defeated the Gupta lords.<sup>33</sup> Similarly, Iśānavarman, who belonged to the feudatory Maukhari clan, defeated the Gauḍas, Andhras and Śūlikas and assumed the imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja.<sup>34</sup> At the time of Budha Gupta (476-495/96 A. D.) we find that the Gupta feudatories, like the

Parivrājaka Mahārājas of Bundelkhand, Jayanātha of the Uchchhakalpa dynasty, the Pāṇḍuvamśa, ruling over South Kosala and Mahārāja Lakṣmaṇa of Allahabad and Rewah, and Mahārāja Subandhu, ruling in Māhiṣmati<sup>35</sup> (Māndhātā) on the Narmadā did not care to make any reference to their Gupta overlord in their copper-plates.

Another factor giving rise to the centrifugal tendency of feudalism in the Gupta period was the practice of making the post of military governor hereditary. Bhaṭārka, a general belonging to the Maitraka clan, was appointed military governor of Surāṣṭra. The post then went to Dharaśena I, who was succeeded by his brother, Droṇasiṃha, who became so very important that he "had to be installed as *Mahārājā* by his suzerain".<sup>36</sup> The consequences of such hereditary succession was that "after 467 A. D. there is no evidence that the Imperial Guptas had anything to do with Surāṣṭra or the major part of Western Malwa".<sup>37</sup>

The bigger feudatory rulers of the Gupta age began the practice of sub-infeudation. Dr. D. C. Sircar brings forward the evidence of the Nirmand inscription showing how *Mahāsāmanta Mahārāja* Varuṇasena enjoyed the allegiance of smaller feudatories. *Mahārāja* Vaiṇyagupta (507-508 A. D.) had two vassals under him, namely, *Pādādāsa Mahārāja* Rudradatta and *Mahārāja Mahāsāmanta* Vijayasena. The latter, according to the Gunaighar grant, held the office of *Mahāpratīhāra Pañchadhikaraṇoparika*.<sup>38</sup>

### *Development of feudalism :*

Feudalism gained a strong foothold in Northern India in the period between 600 and 1000 A. D.. Almost all the ruling dynasties in the period had a number of feudatories. In Assam, Harjjaravarman had under him the *Senādhyakṣya* Suchitta, as his Mahāsāmanta.<sup>40</sup> Śaśāṅka himself was a Mahāsāmanta of Rohtasgarh before he became an independent ruler.<sup>41</sup> *Mahārāja* Mahāsāmanta Śrī Mādhavarāja II of Sailodbhava dynasty ruling over Koṅgoḍa was a feudatory of Śaśāṅka in

619 A. D.. There are records showing that the pre-Pāla rulers of Bengal, like Samāchāradeva, Devakhaḍga and Jayanāga, had *sāmantas* under them.<sup>43</sup> The early Pāla rulers had numerous *sāmantas* who used to assemble at the Imperial Darbars of which we get a description in the Khalimpur copper-plate of Dharmapāla.<sup>44</sup> In Orissa, the Bhaumakaras and the Somavarṁśī kings had also feudatories.<sup>45</sup> Harṣavardhana<sup>46</sup> and the Gurjara-Pratīhāra emperors managed to rule their extensive empires with the help of feudatories. The Gurjara-Pratīhāras had such feudatories as the Chandrātreyas of Jejākabhukti,<sup>47</sup> the Guhilas,<sup>48</sup> the Kalachuris,<sup>49</sup> Guṇāmbodhideva Kalachuri of Gorakhpur<sup>50</sup> and the Chāhamānas.<sup>51</sup> The Rāṣtrakūṭas who built up a considerable empire, had under them feudatories like Karkka and his successors ruling over Southern Gujarat, the Raṭṭas of Saundatti, Śilāhāras of Thānā<sup>52</sup> and the Paramāras of Malwa.<sup>53</sup> The process of sub-infeudation also went on without any hindrance during this age. Dr. Altekar has shown how the more powerful feudatories of the Rāṣtrakūṭas, like the Gujarat Rāṣtrakūṭas and the Śilāhāras "could create their own sub-feudatories".<sup>54</sup> Amongst the feudatories of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras, Kokkalla I (c. 875-925 A. D.) of the Kalachuri family made each of his seventeen sons a *maṇḍalapati* of his kingdom.<sup>55</sup>

If in the Gupta period military governorship was conferred on important feudal chiefs, in the age of Harṣa and of Imperial Kanauj, high ranking civil as well as military offices come to be bestowed upon persons holding feudal titles. Thus during the reign of Harṣavardhana, according to the Banskhera plate, *Mahāsāmanta* Skanda Gupta was the *Mahāpramātūra* and *Mahāsāmanta Mahārāja* Bhāna was the *Mahākshapaṭalādhipikaraṇādhipikṛita* and according to the Madhuban plate *Sāmanta Mahārāja* Īśvaragupta was the *Mahākshapaṭalādhipikṛita*. In the empire of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras, *Mahāsāmantaṭdhipati* Undabhaṭa was *Mahāpratīhāra* in the reign of Mahendrapāla I and *Mahāsāmanta* Viṣṇurāma was governor of Luachchhagiri in the reign of Bhoja.<sup>57</sup> In the Rāṣtrakūṭa

empire Dalla, a *Sāmanta* held the office of foreign minister in the reign of Dhruva.<sup>58</sup> *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* Kundamarāja was the *viṣayapati* of Kuntala-Viṣaya<sup>59</sup> in 1019 A. D. In Orissa, we find Malladatta and the members of his family, holding the rank of *Rāṇaka*, were appointed to the post of *sandhivigrahin* under the Somavaṃśī kings.<sup>60</sup>

The twin practices of creating *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvaras*, *māṇḍalikas* etc. and that of allowing their sons to succeed not only to the title but also to the official position of the father, as we find in the case of Malladatta's family or among the descendants of Bankeya in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom, were as certain to promote the tendency to assert independence among feudal chiefs as in mediaeval Europe. The titles and offices of Counts and Dukes were originally conferred during the sovereign's pleasure in the Merovingian period, but Hallam points out that "the claim of a son to succeed his father would often be found too plausible or too formidable to be rejected, and it is highly probable that even under the Merovingian kings, these provincial governors had laid the foundations of that independence which was destined to change the countenance of Europe".<sup>61</sup>

Thus the essential features of a feudal polity were manifested even before the advent of the eleventh century. High offices in the state came to be regarded as a prerogative of the land-owning aristocracy. The rank of a *Rāṇaka* or *Mahā-sāmantādhipati* carried with it the command over considerable areas of land. The principle of hereditary succession to office contributed to the insecurity of the central authority.

*Hey day of feudalism :*

The period between 1030 and 1194 A. D. may be regarded as the hey day of feudal anarchy. In the period intervening between the invasions of Sultān Mahmūd and that of Shihāb-ud-dīn Muhammad of Ghūr, the feudatories acquired so much power and influence that it became necessary for the King to watch their movement and conduct very carefully. Explaining the maxim of Manu that the King should ponder



over the conduct of his "Circle", Medhātithi<sup>62</sup> states that the term "Circle" refers to the tendency to peace and war of his provincial governors". Someśvara in his *Mānasollāsa* advises that at the time of appointing the Minister of Peace and War, the King should consider whether the candidate is an expert in inviting, bidding adieu to and establishing feudatories, and especially those who deserve special honour.<sup>63</sup> This is really remarkable in as much as in normal circumstances, the Minister of Peace and War has to deal with foreign powers and not with internal disturbances created by feudal chiefs. The latter must have assumed so much importance in this period that it was considered advisable to entrust the Minister of Peace and War with the extremely delicate task of keeping them in good humour.

The feudal lords maintained their own army. Śukranītisāra draws a distinction between *Gulmībhūta* army and the *Agulmaka* army<sup>64</sup>—the former being under the officers of the State, while the latter were under their own chiefs. These chiefs were in all likelihood, the feudal rulers, because the same work states that an expedition in which the King is aided by his feudatories, is known as the *Sambhūya* expedition.<sup>65</sup> When the King was strong and efficient, the vassals used to respond to his call, but whenever they detected any sign of weakness on his part, they indulged in private wars with their private army. Thus Ḍommanapāla or (Ma)-ḍommanapāla of Khāḍī-*maṇḍala* (Sunderbans) made war against the neighbouring *sāmāntas* and made them helpless.<sup>66</sup> In Kashmir, the *ḍāmaras* Janakachandra and Bhīmadeva,<sup>67</sup> along with their respective adherents, started a furious fight in the reign of Uchchala. Again, Kīrttipāla,<sup>68</sup> brother of Kelhaṇa, of Naḍḍūla and a feudatory of the Chaulukyas, fought against the feudatory Paramāra line of Jālor and deprived them of their territory sometime after 1179 A. D. The Rajim stone inscription records that Jagapāla, a feudatory of Jājalladeva I of the Kalachuri family of Ratanpur, struck terror into the heart of the *maṇḍaleśvaras* of Māyurika and

Sāvanta and that the latter fled to the mountains.<sup>69</sup> The feudatories, of course, had the right to adopt defensive measures and to undertake war in self-defence without reference to their overlord. Thus Barma Daṇḍin-gova of Toragale dispersed a crowd of hostile feudatory rulers<sup>70</sup> who had appeared against him in about 1187-88 A. D.

Some of the powerful feudatories exercised not only the right to wage wars but also entered into treaties with sovereigns of other States. An actual form of the treaty entered into by the *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Rāṇaka Lavaṇaprasāda* with *Mahārājādhirāja* Siṃhanadeva of the Devaḡiri—Yādava family in 1232 A. D. has been preserved in the *Lekhāpad-dhati*.<sup>71</sup> It shows the High Contracting parties agreed not to invade the country of each other and that, in case of invasion by a powerful enemy, the two parties should jointly oppose the invader. The most significant feature of the treaty is the denial of the right of harbourage to any other noble who might flee into the territory of the other party with any valuable thing. In such a case the parties agreed to restore the valuables in the refugee's possession.

#### *Causes of increasing number of feudatories:*

The period under review witnessed a tremendous increase in the number of feudatories. The kings of mediaeval India were themselves responsible for it. Among the eight objectives of the king, one was the conversion of princes into tributary chiefs of feudatory vassals. As in the earlier works on polity, *Śukranītisāra*<sup>72</sup> categorically states that the victorious kings should grant half and a quarter of the revenues of the subjugated kingdom to the vanquished king's son and wife respectively. Such magnanimity was considered a suitable display of the majesty of the conqueror. Numerous instances can be cited to show that the kings of Northern India translated the above-mentioned precept into practice. The family of Devarakṣita of Piṭhī, who was defeated by Rāmapāla's maternal uncle, Maḥaṇa, was allowed to rule. In the period

between 1075 and 1135 A. D. the Somavaṃśīs were allowed to continue to exercise sway in subordination to the Eastern Gaṅga kings. If we accept Dr. Sircar's interpretation of Somavaṃśī chronology, we find that though Viravarakesarin was ousted by Anantavarman Choḍagaṅga, yet his relatives, Karṇakesarī and Raṇakesarī, were allowed to rule over Orissa as feudatories.<sup>73</sup> The rule of Jayasīṃha (c. 1055-1059/60 A. D.), successor of Bhoja Paramāra, also shows that in spite of the fact that Chālukya Someśvara and Kalachuri Karṇa decisively defeated Bhoja, yet they allowed the relation of the vanquished king to succeed to the throne of Dhārā.<sup>74</sup> The Chaulukyas of Anahillapāṭaka also followed the same principle with regard to the relatives of defeated kings like Barbaraka<sup>75</sup> and Vikramasīṃha.<sup>76</sup> Kashmir was no exception. Somavarman ruled Chambā valley as a vassal of the Kashmir King, though his father had been defeated by Ananta.<sup>77</sup> The Gāhaḍavālas also appear to have adopted the policy of retaining the defeated king's family as feudatories so far as their policy relating to the Kalachuris<sup>78</sup> was concerned.

There were, however, certain circumstances in which it was not feasible for the victor to allow any member of the vanquished family to continue to rule over the territory even in the capacity of a vassal. Thus when a feudal family had taken recourse to treachery and risen in rebellion against its liege-lord it was considered prudent to uproot it. Kumārapāla deposed the rebel Tiṃgyadeva and installed Vaidyadeva as the ruler of Assam. Again, a particular area which appeared to be exceptionally important to the victor for economic or strategic reasons could not be permitted to continue under the rule of the family of the defeated king. Thus the Chaulukya ruler Jayasīṃha, having killed Navaghana, the Ābhīra ruler in a battle, directly annexed the valuable Surāṣṭra territory to his kingdom. He appointed Sajjana as his *Daṇḍādhipati* "to superintend the affairs of Surāṣṭra."<sup>79</sup>

The increase in the number of feudatories was also due to the allotment of territories to brothers and relatives of the kings. This policy of avoiding enmity of the relatives or *dāyūdas* really gained acceleration from the eighth century onwards. In the period between 1030 and 1194 A. D., we find many instances of creation of fiefs for satisfying the relatives. The Somavamśi king Uddyotakesarī Mahābhavagupta IV made Abhimanyu a sub-king of the western parts of his dominion.<sup>80</sup> Not only in Orissa, but also in other parts of Northern India,<sup>81</sup> fiefs were granted to the sons, brothers and nephews of the King. Even in the disturbed kingdom of Kashmir, the kings tried to save themselves from ambitious relatives by granting estates to the latter. Queen Diddā committed the great mistake of allowing her nephew Vigraharāja to rule over the fortress of Lohara, while nominating the latter's younger brother Saṁgrāmarāja as her successor to the throne. Utkarṣa (1089 A. D.) realised the mistake and united the two kingdoms. After the death of Harṣa, Kashmir and Lohara again came to be under separate rule. While Uchchala took Kashmir, his brother Sussala remained in Lohara to make onslaughts on his elder brother, till he himself became King in 1112 A.D.. Jayasimha, as King of Kashmir, kept the fortress under his control with great difficulty till he crowned his son Gulhaṇa as the ruler of Lohara.

The necessity of curbing the ambition of feudatories and especially of the relatives was well known to the writers of Hindu polity. While the Agni Purāṇa<sup>82</sup> states that the *sāmantas* are to be treated as enemies, Śukranīṭisāra<sup>83</sup> lays down that the relatives are to be accorded such treatment by the king as not to give rise to any dissatisfaction or difference of opinion. The same writer advises that "the king should arrange for these heirs the same kind of comforts and enjoyments as for himself, and should be strict in command in satisfying them with umbrellas and thrones" (I. 693-694) and further "he (King) should station them

(*dāyādas*) in various quarters by paying them one-fourth of the royal revenues or make them governors of provinces. He may appoint them, as heads of cows, elephants" etc. So the author of the *Śukranītisāra* opines that the relatives are to be made either officials or governors of state and given the rank of feudatories. Rank in the Court was determined by closeness of relation with the monarch as well as by the magnitude of the fief held.

The third factor which increased the number of feudatories was that the King rewarded his officers with land in consideration of valuable services rendered. In the Chambā valley, probably in the eleventh century A. D., the Lord of Kuluṭa was offered a principality for his services by King Āsaṭa.<sup>84</sup> In the Dharwar district, Āhavamalla Bhūteyadeva received the rank of *Maṇḍaleśvara* from the Chaulukya ruler Bhima II for killing Pañchala some time before 1187 A. D..

The practice of allowing a particular office to be held by a particular family on a hereditary basis must have been responsible for strengthening the feudal tendency. The *Mahābhārata* (Sabhā 5. 43) and *Manu* (VII. 54) and *Yājñavalkya* (I. 312) prescribe that the son may be allowed to succeed his father as minister, provided he is capable like the father. *Chandēśvara*,<sup>85</sup> while explaining *Manu* (VII. 48), holds that the *amātyas* are to be appointed on a hereditary basis. But neither the *Arthaśāstra* (I. 9. 15) nor the *Nītivākya-mṛta* (ch. 14) and *Śukranītisāra*<sup>86</sup> enumerate heredity as one of the qualifications of *amātyas* or members of the council of ministers. Of course, heredity was not the only qualification for a minister either in ancient or early mediaeval India.

Political upheavals like dethronement and change of rulers in quick succession did not adversely affect the selection of ministers on strictly hereditary basis as is shown by the dethronement of Devavarman and the short tenure of power of Yaśovarman.<sup>87</sup>

To the ministers, *Mahāpurohita* Jāguśarman and his son

Praharājaśarman, successive Gāhaḍavāla kings like Madana-apāla, Govindachandra, Vijayachandra and Jayachchandra made grants of land on many occasions. The Kamauli grants show that these Brāhmaṇa ministers received grants of villages in Kāṭi, Bṛhagrhe (ye ?) varaṭha, Kesāure (?), Ughaṇaterahaṭṭara, Koṭhatakotiāvarahottara, Saru (ga ?) ra, Haladoya, Maḍavala (?), Rāṇa, Navagāma, Temisapa-chottara, Jiāvai, Bṛihadgrhokamisāra, Mahaso, Unāvisa, Vajaimhāchchhāsaṭhī, Kangali and Kachchhoa pattalās.<sup>88</sup> Similarly, the Chandella King Paramardi granted the village of Nandinī to his Brahmana *Senapati* Madanaṇālaśarman<sup>89</sup> before V. S. 1228/1171 A.D. . The Kalachuri King Prithvi-deva II granted a village to Puruṣottama, the *Sarvādhikārin*.<sup>90</sup>

Contemporary inscriptions show that some of the ministers were feudatories. Kīrttisīmha and Malayasīmha, the son and grandson of Padmasīmha, were powerful not only as ministers but also as vassals of the Kalachuri King Vijayasīmha. Both of these ministers were at the head of a number of *Sāmantas*.<sup>91</sup> In Gujarat<sup>92</sup> and South Bihar<sup>93</sup> such minister-feudatories were Rāṇaka Śrī Chāchigadeva and *Mahāmāṇḍalika* Udayarāja respectively.

Other offices, besides membership of the Council of Ministers, were some times held on hereditary basis. *Rāuta* Rājyadharavarman, son and grandson of *Mahāmahattaka Mahāthakkuras* Vidyādhara and Jagaddhara,<sup>94</sup> was the recipient of a land-grant by the Gāhaḍavāla King Jayachchandra some time before 1177 A. D. . . Similar instances of the Chaulukya and Chandella Kings conferring posts like *Mahāmātya* and feudatory ranks like *Mahāmāṇḍalikas*, *Rāutas* and *Thakkuras* were—Ānanda and his son Prithvīpāla,<sup>95</sup> Vatsarāja and his son Pratāpasīmha,<sup>96</sup> *Rāutas* Pāpe and his son Sāmanta,<sup>97</sup> Devashamū, his son Jagadeva and grandson Haripāla,<sup>98</sup> and *Thakkura* Mahesvara and his son Bhonapāla<sup>99</sup>. It appears also that the Chaulukyas allowed the son to succeed to the office of the father even in an administrative area like a *maṇḍala*.

*Causes of increase of power of feudatories :*

The natural consequence of the creation of so many feudatories was that they gradually consolidated their position. Frequent change of frontiers, constant wars of succession of weak kings made these feudatories stronger. We find the largest number in Kashmir and Gujarat-Kathiawar regions. The feudatories of the Pālas went on increasing from the times of Nayapāla and Vigrahapāla III. During these reign-periods, Bengal and Bihar suffered from invasions of the mighty Kalachuris and Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa.

The feudatories enhanced their power further by inter-marriages amongst themselves<sup>100</sup>. They also entered into matrimonial relations with royal families. These alliances indicate the strengthening of the power of fief-holders, and the consequent weakening of the position of kings. Such a political situation bears a close resemblance to that prevailing in England in the later Plantagenet period when many feudal nobles entered into matrimony with the huge progeny of Edward III and considered themselves not inferior to the monarch. Jātavarman's marriage with Vīraśrī, daughter of the Kalachuri King Karṇa, gave the former viceroyalty of Aṅga. According to Mm. Mirashi<sup>101</sup>, this alliance led to the installation of the Varmanas in place of the Chandras in East Bengal. The vassal-princes and *ḍāmaras* of Kashmir often married their daughters to the kings for strengthening their position and improving their status. Padmaka, the lord of Vallāpura married his daughter to Bhikṣāchāra who was contesting the throne against Sussala. When conspiracies were being formed to dethrone Salhaṇa in favour of Sussala, *Ḍāmara* Gargachandra gave away his two daughters to the successful pretender Sussala. Sussala himself also married Rājalakṣmī and arranged the marriage of Guṇalekhā, the sister of Rājalakṣmī, to his son Jayasīṃha<sup>102</sup>.

The feudatories usually helped such kings as were related to them by marriage. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the credit of resuscitating the Pāla empire goes chiefly to

the Rāṣtrakūṭa chiefs of Aṅga. Rāmapāla received invaluable assistance from his maternal uncle Mathana or Mahaṇa and the latter's sons, Kaṇṇara and Suvarṇadeva, in subjugating Devarakṣita of Piṭhī and in recovering Varendī. Commenting on the marriage between Govindachandra and Kumāradevī, grand-daughter of Mahaṇa of Aṅga, Dr. R. C. Majumdar significantly observes : "this marriage alliance was probably engineered by Mahaṇa as a means to cement the alliance between the Pālas and Gāhaḍavālas<sup>103</sup>." With a similar motive, the Kashmirian pretenders and kings entered into matrimonial alliances with their vassals<sup>104</sup>. The relation of Sussala with the feudatory rulers of Champā and Vallāpura was of considerable help to him in getting back the throne in 1121 A.D. and in securing triumph over Bhikṣāchara in 1122 A. D. Sussala and Jayasimha sought matrimonial alliance with Somapāla of Rājapurī on account of the latter's influence and strength.

The monarchical power was further weakened by the granting away of extensive tracts of land along with the right to levy taxes to the donees. The surrender of the right to taxation in the area donated was a severe blow to the power of the king and such a practice encouraged some of the powerful donees to throw off their allegiance to the successors of the donors. The Gāhaḍavālas made land grants to *Thakkuras*, Devapālaśarman (Basahi pl. c. 1116 A.D.), Bālādityaśarman (Raiwan grant c. 1130 A. D.), Devavarman, Bhūpati and Śrīdhara (Gagaha pl. c. 1143 A. D.), Śrīdhara (Lar pl. c. 1146 A.D.), Kulhe and Anantaśarman (Bangavan pl. c. 1151 A. D.), and *Rāuta* Rājyadharavarman. They usually granted the donees the right to collect *bhāgabhogakara*, *pravaṇikara* and *туруskadanda* taxes.

#### *Legal Status :*

In Europe, as well as in India, feudal theory laid great emphasis on the sacrosanct character of the king's person. The king stood at the head of the feudal hierarchy. He is often



described in inscriptions and literature as having his feet worshipped by dependent princes. According to the *Prabandhachintāmaṇi*<sup>105</sup> the Kalachuri King Karṇa had as many as 136 subordinate kings who obeyed him. The author of the *Mānasollāsa* considered feudalism such a well-established institution that one of the functions of the Minister of Peace and War was to keep close contact with the feudatories.<sup>106</sup> The vassals not only attended the royal court but also received dresses from the Emperor at the time of witnessing elephant sports and games.<sup>107</sup> These feudatories are mentioned in the official grants of almost all the dynasties of Northern India.

The institution of feudalism became an integral part of the early mediaeval monarchy in Northern India. *Sāmantas* participated in the royal coronation. Lakṣmīdhara, quoting *Brahma Purāṇa*, states that at the time of coronation-bath, the *sāmantas* and ministers hold the umbrella and wave fly-whisk etc.<sup>108</sup> This ceremony is further elaborated in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* which has not been referred to by Lakṣmīdhara but quoted by Mitramiśra in his *Vīramitrodaya*.<sup>109</sup> This probably indicates the formal acceptance of the king by the ministers, priests and feudatories and ultimately, by the people.

Another practice which was observed immediately after the coronation was the participation of feudals in a ceremonial dinner. According to the *Brahma Purāṇa*.<sup>110</sup> the king shares out the given food to the dependants and then eats himself. This partaking of food by the king was given a feudal touch at least as early as the ninth century A. D. . Abu Zeid, visiting India in 867 A. D., gives an elaborate description of the ceremonial feast.<sup>111</sup> Those officials who had had the privilege of dining with the king were bound to sacrifice their life at the funeral pyre of the king. A parallel to it may be found also in Tacitus, who states that when Otto committed suicide, some soldiers slew themselves near his funeral pyre, "not because of any fault or from fear, but

prompted by a desire to imitate his glorious example and moved by affection for their emperor".<sup>112</sup>

The description of arrangement of seats in the royal court also shows how feudalism became part and parcel of the system of government in our period. According to the *Sukranītisāra*,<sup>113</sup> the sons, grandsons, brothers and nephews sat at the back and the daughter's sons on the right of the king. Uncles, superiors of the king, members of the assembly, agnates and cognates sat in front of the king, to his right, sat other elders of the family or his maternal grandfather, ministers, and to the left sat the father-in-law and brothers-in-law and officers (*adhikāriṇaḥ*). But the *Mānasollāsa*<sup>114</sup> gives a different order of seats. While the princes (*Kumāras*) and the priest sat in front of the king, the *maṇḍalādhiśvaras* or governors of *maṇḍalas*, *sāmāntāmātyakas* or feudatory-princes and their ministers in front of the king on the right and left sides.

Amongst the agnates, close relatives of the kings, the vassals wearing crowns, the *sāmantas* and the *maṇḍalādhiśvaras* who were allotted seats in the royal court, were also some of the princes who had been defeated in war and given the status of vassals.

#### *Grades of Vassals:*

The grades of feudatories are indicated by titles such as *mahāsāmāntādhipati*, *mahāsāmanta*, *mahāmaṇḍaleśvara*, *rājanyaka māṇḍalika*, *nṛpa*, *sāmanta*, *rāṇaka*, *rāuta*, and *ṣhakkura*. All these grades, however, cannot be found in each and every kingdom. Though we come across the title *Maṇḍaleśa*,<sup>115</sup> we do not find a *mahāsāmanta*, *rāṇaka*, *māṇḍalika* or *mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* in Kashmir. Titles of *rāutas* are not found in the grants of the Pāla rulers. Similarly, the rank of *mahāsāmāntādhipati* or *maṇḍalādhipati* is not mentioned in the grants of the Gāhaḍavālas.

The order of precedence of these feudatories cannot be definitely ascertained. The title of *Rāṇaka* was held by the Bhañjas of Khimjalimaṇḍala. (Ma)ḍommanapāla, who

was practically an independent chief in the Sena Kingdom, retained the titles of *Rāṇaka* and *Mahāsāmanta*, though he also styled himself as *Mahārāja*. *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* Lavaṇa-prasāda, Viradhavala, and *Mahāmāṇḍalika* Piplārāja, ruler of Kekind held the title of *Rāṇaka*. It appears from the Toragel inscription (line 8) that *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* Bhūta was above the *māṇḍalikas* (*māṇḍalikamukha-darpaṇa* I. A. XII. 96). In the same Chaulukya kingdom to which Bhūta and his ancestors belonged, we find that the Paramāra chief Dhārāvārṣa of Chandrāvati,<sup>116</sup> who had the same status of a vassal-governor, was given the title of *Māṇḍalika* only. Sometimes an ordinary feudal lord like Sāhilla, endowed with the status of *Thakkura*, attained the right of using the *Pañcha-mahāśabda*.<sup>117</sup> In an earlier period, *Sāmantas* Bappabhaṭṭi and Maṇḍalla, who wrote the records respectively in 739 and 775<sup>118</sup> A.D., used *pañcha-mahāśabda*. In Bengal, while under the Pālas, the *rāṇakas* have no place in the order of precedence, as given in their inscriptions, the Madanpur plate of Śrī-chandra<sup>119</sup> gives precedence to the *rāṇaka* over the *rājaputra*, *mahāsandhivigrahaika*, *mahāsenāpati* and *mahāsāmanta*.

Literature, however, clearly distinguishes between various orders of 'kings' and feudatories. The criteria may have been the use of crowns or revenue or judicial power. According to the *Mānasāra*, there were eight types of feudatories under the *Sārvabhauma* or *Chakravartī* ruler. The last four grades of feudatories, namely, *maṇḍaleśa*, *paṭṭabhujā*, *prāhāraka* and *astragrāha*, were definitely landed aristocrats. Hemachandra categorically states that the *maṇḍalādhiśa* is a second-rate king, who has to depend on others, has authority only over an area designated *maṇḍala* and is below the *Chakravartī* emperor.<sup>120</sup>

But the *Śukranītisāra*<sup>121</sup> distinguishes between the various grades of feudatories on the basis of annual income and area of jurisdiction. The *Svarāj* type of king had either an annual income varying from fiftyone lakhs to one crore of *karṣas* or, who realised the revenue of 10,000 villages. Below the *Svarāj*, the *mahārājā* had an annual revenue of 21 to 50 lakhs

*Karṣas*, *Nṛipa-māṇḍalika* to 10 lakhs *Karṣas*, *Sāmanta-nṛipa* upto 30 lakhs, and *sāmantas* having an annual income of one lakh *Karṣas*.<sup>122</sup> The above-mentioned text also informs us that there were several types of *sāmantas*, viz. *Hina* and *Anu-sāmantas* who received salary from the king-emperor. In Kashmir, some of the *ḍāmaras* were appointed on a salary basis by King Jayasiṁha.<sup>123</sup> Kalhaṇa states that by this policy of appointing *ḍāmaras* in salaried service, King Jayasiṁha "increased (the number) of those who belonged to the inner court (*ābhyantara*), while reducing (the number of persons) of the outer court (*vāhya*),"<sup>124</sup>

It is noteworthy that neither the earlier works like the *Mahābhārata*,<sup>125</sup> *Viṣṇusmṛiti*,<sup>126</sup> and *Viṣṇudharmottara*,<sup>127</sup> nor later works like the *Mānasollāsa*,<sup>128</sup> *Kṛtyakalpataru-Rājadharmakāṇḍa*<sup>129</sup> and the *Rājanīratnākara* give the status of *sāmanta* to those persons appointed by the Emperor to look after the administration of 10, 20, 100, or 1000 villages.

The legal status of feudatories is fully discussed in *Chañḍeśvara's Rājanīratnākara*, which was written in the early part of the fourteenth century A. D. . *Chañḍeśvara* was a feudatory himself, holding the title of *Mahārāja* and serving as the Prime Minister of *Harisiṁhadeva* of the *Karṇāṭa Brāhmiṇ* dynasty. His father's younger brother *Gaṇeśvara* is described in his son *Rāmadatta's Chāndogya-mantroddhāra* as *Mahārājādhirāja Mahāsāmantapālita Mahāmāhattakeśa*, and his another son, *Govindadatta*, describes him in *Govindamānasollāsa* as *Śrīmaṇeṣa-Mahāmahat-taka Mahārājādhirāja-Mahā-sāmantādhipatir-vikasvara Yaśaḥ puṣpasya janmadrumaḥ*.<sup>131</sup> He has defined three classes of sovereigns, namely *saṃrāt*, *rājā* and *adhīśvara*. Quoting the *Mahābhārata*<sup>132</sup> and *Manu*, he states that *Rājās* and *adhīśvaras* are below the rank of a *saṃrāt*, who collects taxes from all kings. It appears from *Manu*, as quoted by *Chañḍeśvara* that *Sa-karas* or those paying tributes regularly every month or every year were known as *Rājās* and the *A-karas* were those who paid tributes occasionally on the pretext of cour-

tesy-visits to the *samrāj*, were known as *adhīśvaras*.<sup>133</sup> He describes the *A-kara Adhīśvaras* as belonging to two varieties,<sup>134</sup> namely, one who rules by his own prowess and awards punishment according to his own will, and the other who is exempted from payment of tribute by favour of the emperor. He also refers to an unnamed Smṛiti work in support of the second type of *a-kara adhīśvara*. But the first type paid some tributes on pretext of courtesy call or by sending envoys.

Chāṇḍeśvara opines that *sa-kara rājās* are also of two kinds.<sup>135</sup> The first, called the *adhikritadaṇḍa*, has the right to administer criminal justice and their decision is final. But in civil cases there is an appeal from their judgment to the emperor. But those *sa-kara rājās* who are called *anadhikritadaṇḍa* have the right to administer civil law but have got no power to award punishment or no jurisdiction over criminal cases. The civil cases decided by them may be referred to the Emperor in appeal. If he rashly usurps more power or goes against the sovereign, he becomes liable, in case of *sāhasa* to pecuniary punishment; but in cases where *sāhasa* is not involved, the emperor shows his displeasure by refusing him interview for two or three days and by rebukes.

There were elaborate ceremonies like delivery of a turf, stone, wand, etc., with which a fief used to be conferred on a vassal in mediaeval Europe. In India, we come across only one ceremonial form, which was the conferring of the *pañchamahāśabda*. This ceremony was not prevalent before the eighth century A. D.. We do not read of it in the records of the Maurya—Gupta emperors. It came to be conferred on the feudatories by the Valabhīs, Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Chaulukyas, Gurjara-Pratihāras and the Bhañjas of Orissa. The five instruments, which were associated with *pañchamahāśabda*, were according to the Vivekachintāmaṇi viz., *śrīṅga* or horn, *tammaṭa* or haliage, tabor or timbrel, *śaṅkha* or conch, *bherī* or kettledrum and *jayaghanī* or bell, cymbal or gong.<sup>136</sup> The term, however, was used in Kashmir in a

different sense. It appears from the Rājatarāṅgiṇī (IV. 140-143 and 680) that *pañchamahāśabda* was conferred on Mitraśarma and Utpalaka by Lalitāditya and Chippaṭajayāpīḍa respectively, because they controlled the five offices viz., *mahāpratīhārapīḍa* (high chamberlain), *mahāsandhivigrahika* (minister of foreign affairs), *mahāśvaśālā* (chief master of horse), *mahābhāṇḍāgāra* (high keeper of treasury) and *mahāsādhanabhāga* (chief executive officer).<sup>137</sup> Whatever might have been the meaning of the title, it is certain that *pañchamahāśabda* was conferred only on very powerful and influential feudatories. During the period under survey, this rank was enjoyed by vassals of the Chaulukyas, Paramāras, Kalachuris of Tripurī and Ratanpur, and Somavaṁśī kings.<sup>138</sup>

The above-mentioned feudatories, it will be seen, flourished mostly in the period when the power of their respective suzerains declined. The period in which *Mahākumāras* Lakṣmīvarman, Hariśchandra, Udayavarman and Devapāla flourished (c. 1144-1218 A.D.), were the worst days for the Paramāras of Malwa.

The titles of the Telugu-Choḍa King Someśvaradevavarman II (c. 1105-1130 A. D.), as recorded in the Mahada plates are interesting. He is styled as *Pañchamahāśabdasamanvita Mahāmahimaṇḍaleśvara Mahābhūpatimalla* and *chakravartin* in the plates. Dr. D. C. Sircar and M. Venkataramayya rightly observe, that "this combination of subordinate and imperial titles shows that the issuer of the Charter owed only nominal allegiance to the overlords of his predecessors."<sup>139</sup> Someśvara of South Kośala was possibly a feudatory of Someśvara, the Chhindaka-Nāga King. These two Someśvaras were fighting for the control of Suvarṇapura against the Kalachuri King Jājalladeva I and the Somavaṁśī king Someśvara Bhujaballa.<sup>140</sup>

#### *Obligations of vassals:*

On being invested with a fief, the feudatories had to assume certain obligations. According to Dr. A. S. Altekar,

the feudatories were not permitted to issue coins and they had to (a) mention the name of the overlord, (b) attend the imperial Court on ceremonial occasions, (c) pay regular tribute, (d) make presents on festive occasions and when daughters were married and (e) send a certain number of troops.<sup>141</sup>

The name of the overlord is mentioned in almost all the epigraphs of the feudatories, excepting the cases where they had assumed almost complete sovereignty. The omission of the name of the overlord was a common feature of the periods of succession of weak rulers in all the dynasties during our period. (Maṇḍommanapāla,<sup>142</sup> a feudatory of Lakṣmaṇasena, Mahānṛpati Indradhavalā,<sup>143</sup> whose ancestors were feudatories of the Gāhaḍavālas, Vyāsa Maṛyādāsāgara and Soḍhadeva,<sup>144</sup> feudatory of the Gurjara-Pratihāras, Paramāras of Jalor<sup>145</sup> after 1055 A. D., Chhittarājadeva,<sup>146</sup> feudatory of Chaulukya Bhīma I and Someśvara II of the Telegu Choḍa lineage, feudatory of the Nāgavaṃśī kings, do not mention the names of their overlords while making grants. Similarly, when the Kalachuris of Ratanpur became strong enough to assert their independence, they ceased to regard themselves as *mahāmaṇḍaleśvaras* under the Kalachuris of Tripurī. The successors of Pṛithvīdeva I made land-grants without any reference to their former suzerains at Tripurī.

That the feudatories had to attend the imperial court on ceremonial occasions is evident from contemporary inscriptions and literature.<sup>147</sup> They were present at the time of the coronation of the King. The commentary to the Rāmacharita IV. 16 states that *Maṇḍalādhipati* Chandra of Aṅga "caused jubilation among the people by spreading out the rich collection of materials for the coronation ceremony" of King Madanapāla. Similarly, the vassals of Kashmir attended the coronation of Gulhana at Lohara.<sup>148</sup>

The obligation of vassals to pay tributes to the king is clear from Chaṇḍeśvara's Rājanītiratnākara.<sup>149</sup> Inscriptions

clearly prove that the kings raised tributes from feudatories. The Ratanpur inscription (verses 21-23) dated K.S. 861/1114 A.D., states that Jājalladeva I received annual tribute or presents from the chiefs of *maṇḍalas* of (Dakṣi)ṇa Kośala, Andhra Khimḍi, Vairāgara, Lañjikā, Bhānāra, Talahāri, Daṇḍakapura, Nandāvoli and Kukkuṭa.<sup>150</sup>

The obligation of military service of the feudal lords to their overlords bears close resemblance to that in Europe. Though the number of days of military service was not fixed as in Europe and Jerusalem,<sup>151</sup> yet it can be said with certainty that the North Indian feudatories had to adhere to the King's side, while the latter fought against other powers. It has already been shown that the Śukranītisāra (IV.7.9-21, 481 and 514-15), Mānasollāsa (II. 114 -1147) and Rāmacharita (I. 45 and II. 2) categorically state that the feudal soldiers helped the kings in wars. Not only in recovery of Varendri, but also in the victorious expeditions against Piṭhī, Assam, Orissa, the feudatory chiefs rallied to the cause of Rāmapāla. If the reading of the Rājibpur inscription by Bhaṭṭasali<sup>152</sup> is accepted, Gopāla III was fortunate in having been served by Aṇḍadeva and his eight other associates in his deadly struggle with the Senas in 1140 A.D. The Paramāras of Malwa were helped to a great extent by their collateral feudatories of Vāgaḍa,<sup>153</sup> in their wars against the Gurjaras. Similarly, other contemporary dynasties<sup>154</sup> received military help from their vassals on many occasions and expeditions. Arjuna, a feudatory of the Chandellas, slew the Gurjara-Pratīhāra King Rājyapāla to the jubilation of his master Vidyādhra. Similarly, Kīrttirāja defended the fort of Gwalior against the onslaught of Sultān Mahmūd in 1022 A.D. The Rajim inscription tells us that *Ṭhakkura* Sāhilla's son Svāmin and grandsons and great-grandson Jagapāl carried on successful wars for their masters, the Kalachuri kings of Ratanpur (I. A. XVII. 136-138).

The history of Kashmir shows that succession to the fief required the sanction and recognition of the overlord in



normal times.<sup>155</sup> It was also true of the feudatory chiefs of Kakareḍikā<sup>156</sup> under the Kalachuris of Tripurī.

### *Sub-infeudation.*

All the big feudatories had their own vassals, like *sāmantas*, *ṭhakkuras*, *rāutas* etc. The commentary of the Rāmacharita II. 5 and 6, states that Rāmapāla's feudatories Lakṣmīśūra of Aparamandār and Soma of Paduvānvā were served by a number of sub-*sāmantas*. Similarly, Malayasiṃha and Salakhaṇavarman, vassals of the Kalachuri Kings of Tripurī had a number of *sāmantas* under them, who are mentioned in inscriptions. The system of sub infeudation can also be found in the kingdom of the Gāhaḍavālas, Chandellas, Paramāras, and Chaulukyas. A number of epigraphs show that almost all big feudal nobles were served by sub-vassals, of the rank of *ṭhakkura*.<sup>158</sup> Amongst these, *ṭhakkuras* Mahāditya, Śīlaṇa (Rewa inscr.) Vāchchhuka, Rāsala (Bhopal pl.) in the kingdom of the Kalachuris and Paramāras were recipients of land grants. The *ṭhakkuras* in Kashmir were so powerful that even kings like Harṣa engaged them to kill Dhamaṭa (RT. VII 1040, 1045). Some of these sub-vassals like *Rāuta* Ānanda under *Rāṇaka* Vijayakarna in Mirzapur district, *Rāṇa* Śaṅkarasiha under *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* Śrī Vapanadeva of Godhra, and *Rāṇaka* Amma under Yaśovarman in Malwa, were rich enough to make donations for temples and deities.<sup>159</sup> At the same time, they were inspired by the idea of loyalty to their immediate liege-lord and sometimes took up arms even against the sovereign of the country. In Kashmir, Mallaka did not hesitate to fight valiantly for his masters Kamaliya and Chatuṣka, who rebelled against King Jayasiṃha.<sup>160</sup>

### *Dis-services of feudalism:*

The increase in the number and strength of the feudatories weakened the central authority in almost every state. The hostile *sāmantas* of Bengal brought about the end of the rule

of Mahīpāla II. Gargachandra, a *ḍāmara* became the king-maker and successively installed three kings, namely, Uchchala, Salhaṇa and Sussala, on the throne of Kashmir. Gargachandra and Sussala quarrelled and soon began a vicious circle of intrigues so common in mediaeval Kashmir.

The feudatories of our period were always on the lookout for becoming independent. It was probably for this reason that the Agni Purāṇa (ch. 226. 11) states that the king should first satisfy the discontented subordinate *sāmantas* and his *amātyas*. Again the same Purāṇa, elsewhere, and the Matsya Purāṇa, as quoted by Mitramiśra,<sup>161</sup> plainly state that the *sāmantas* are to be treated as enemies of the state.

The highly unreliable character of the *sāmantas*, as depicted in the above-mentioned Purāṇas, can be corroborated by inscriptions. If Malayasiṃha of the inscriptions dated KS 944/1192-93 A.D., KS 962/1211 A.D. and KS 963/1212 A. D., be the same person, he transferred his allegiance some time between 1211-1212 A.D., from the Kalachuri King Vijaya-siṃha to the Chandella King Trailokyavarman.<sup>162</sup> Similarly the son and grandsons of Sallakṣaṇavarman, a chieftain of Kakareḍikā and a feudatory of the Kalachuri ruler Vijaya-siṃha, transferred their allegiance to the Chandella King Trailokyavarman, some time during the years 1239-1241 A.D.<sup>163</sup> The Chaulukyas of Anahillapāṭaka also experienced the same misfortune. The Dvyāśrayakāvya<sup>164</sup> informs us that when the *sāmantas* Vijaya and Kṛṣṇa were sent to oppose Vallāla, the usurper of the throne of Malwa, they went over to the side of the latter. King Kumārapāla, to his utter surprise, learnt during the course of a campaign against the Chāhamāna King Arjorāja that his feudatories had been bribed by the latter.<sup>165</sup> In Bengal, the treacherous nobles who changed sides, were *Mahāmāṇḍalika* Īśvaraghosha of Dhekkariya and Śūra chief of Aparaman-dāra in Hoogly district. The Senas, Gāhaḍavālas and *Mahāsāmantādhipati* Nānyadeva, a feudatory to the Karṇāṭa

Chālukya King Vikramāditya VI, established independent kingdoms in Bengal, the Uttar Pradesh and Mithila.

The Rājatarāgiṇī provides us with a vivid picture of the role of feudal barons. These barons of Kashmir, were the most disturbing and at the same time, the most dangerous elements in the state. Like the English barons of the time of Stephen and Matilda, the *ḍāmaras* took sides with the aspirants to the throne in all the wars of succession with a view to securing lands and riches. They also utilised the opportunity to aggrandise themselves by plunder. Kalhaṇa states (RT. VIII 1028) that they neither liked strong kings nor valiant persons desirous of establishing law and order in the country.

The meaning of the word and the exact status of *ḍāmaras* has not been indicated by Kashmiri historians like Kalhaṇa, Jonarāja and Kṣemendra. They were certainly not 'rebels,' a meaning given in the St. Petersburg dictionary.<sup>166</sup> Nor did they belong to a particular tribe known as *lavanyas*,<sup>167</sup> though at times some *ḍāmaras* have been designated as *lavanyas*, as for example Tikkā, Pṛithvīhara, Koṣṭheśvara and *Trillaka*.<sup>168</sup> Had all the *ḍāmaras* been identical with *lavanyas*, the latter would not have been mentioned for the first time in the reign of Harṣa. Nowhere prior to Harṣa's reign, have the *ḍāmaras* been called *lavanyas*. Stein rightly pointed out that the *ḍāmaras* were feudal lords.

It appears that the *ḍāmaras* were influential landed aristocrats. A prosperous cultivator acquiring wealth seems to have been able to enter into the rank of the *ḍāmaras*. Lalitāditya (c. 699-736 A. D.) on his death-bed warned his successors against allowing persons to accumulate property. "Every care should be taken that there should not be left with the villagers more food supply than required for one year's consumption, nor more oxen than wanted for (tillage of) their fields", because, "if they should keep more wealth, they would become in a single year formidable *Ḍāmaras* and strong enough to neglect the commands of the King."<sup>169</sup> The intimate connection between agriculture and these *ḍāmaras*

is noticeable in the following remark of Kalhaṇa. Jayyaka rose to the position of a *ḍāmara* by "the revenue of his land, and by selling victuals as a trader to far-off regions," and "having the ground dug up for a krośa and a half, he filled it constantly with heaps of money (dīnāra) and then had rice plentifully sown over it."<sup>170</sup> The same writer also records elsewhere that they were "cultivators, though they carry arms."<sup>171</sup> He also carefully mentions the locality of these landed aristocrats.<sup>172</sup>

Several factors were responsible for the rise of *ḍāmaras* to power. Frequent wars of succession afforded opportunity to them to aggrandise themselves at the expense of the state by alternately siding with the rival claimants to the throne. In the period between the death of Lalitāpīḍa and accession of Jayasīṃha, there were forty-six kings, out of whom as many as thirty were either puppets or rulers for an extremely short period.

Like the feudatories of other kingdoms in northern India, the *ḍāmaras* increased their power by giving their daughters and sisters to the royal princes. It is rather startling to find that there is not a single instance of a *ḍāmara* marrying a royal princess. The *ḍāmaras* had under their command both infantry and cavalry forces and occupied fortified castles.

The *ḍāmaras* were probably not in possession of cavalry force till the accession of Uchchala to the throne in 1101 A.D. As early as 855-856 A. D., in the reign of Avantīvarman, Dhanva, a *ḍāmara* appeared before Śūra with a regiment of infantry.<sup>173</sup> And even as late as Harṣa's reign (1089-1101 A. D.) "the *ḍāmaras* who, being themselves mostly on foot, were afraid of the (king's) cavalry, brought him (i.e. Uchchala) up once more by the difficult mountain route of Lohara."<sup>174</sup> But with the weakening of royal authority, the *ḍāmaras* strengthened themselves by recruiting cavalry from the beginning of the twelfth century.

The *ḍāmaras* lived in castles. Probably, the term *upaveśana*,<sup>175</sup> used by Kalhaṇa for their residence means little

castles. In the greater portions of the valley of Maḍavarāja, we find the *upaveśanas* of the *ḍāmaras* in Khaḍūvī, Holaḍā, Samāṅgāsā, Utrāsā, Devasarasa, Kalyāṇapura, Naunagara and Degrāma.<sup>176</sup> These areas and other seats of *ḍāmaras* in Selyapura, Śamāla, Lahara and Rājavihara had great strategic importance

Thus the *ḍāmaras* flourishing in a period of chronic disorder naturally fished in troubled waters. During our period, they were in the ascendancy in the court as well as in the country. *Ḍāmaras* attained predominance in the reign of Saṁgrāmarāja<sup>177</sup> (1003-1028 A. D.), and continued to dominate the scene till the period of our survey.<sup>178</sup>

The history of Kashmir in the Lohāra period is a history of the attempts of the *ḍāmaras* to capture and retain political power in their own hands. They were emblems of anarchy and disorder. Their main interest was always to maintain a chaotically weak administration. They did not try to restrain the king from cruel oppressions, nor did they work for a stable government. They set up Salhaṇa on the throne and during his rule, robbers did not hesitate to plunder the people at mid-day, "what need to speak more of the traffic on roads" (RT VIII 418). Almost similar was the condition in the reign of Bhikṣāchara. In the reign of Jayasīmha, the *ḍāmaras* offered help to Somapāla. They knew that this chieftain of Rājapurī, on account of the defects of his person and character, would allow them to have "the pleasures of the rule entirely for themselves." (RT. VIII 1490-1492).

There are numerous instances to show that much of the misery of mediaeval Kashmir was due to the rapacious nature of the *ḍāmaras*.

The Kashmirian kings were equally unfortunate with regard to their vassal states. Harṣa had to undertake a war against Saṁgrāmapāla of Rājapurī.<sup>179</sup> But when anarchy set in, Saṁgrāmapāla gave shelter openly to the pretender Uchchala. Sussala had to meet a more formidable conspiracy of the vassal hill-states. Queen Āsamatī purchased

their help in favour of the exiled pretender Bhikṣāchara. Jāsaṭa of Champa, Vajradhara of Babbāpura, Rājā Sahajapāla of Vartula and the Crown-princes of Trigarta and Vallāpura espoused the cause of the pretender. The rebellion, however, collapsed for lack of funds.<sup>160</sup> Again, soon after the disposal of Gargachandra, the *dāmarā* Somapāla invited Bhikṣāchara to his estate. Consequently, the king dethroned Somapāla and set up Nāgapāla. But shortly within a year, Nāgapāla had to vacate the throne for Somapāla. The ruler of Rājapuri continued his activities against Sussala. But even after setting up friendly Bhikṣāchara on the throne, Somapāla could not forget his old enmity with Sussala. He pursued and attacked Sussala, who had taken refuge at Lohara after his abdication.<sup>161</sup> The exiled king secured victory over the disaffected chief at Paṇṭosa in 1121 A. D. He continued his nefarious activities in the reign of Sussala's successor, Jayasīṃha.

### *Estimate :*

The evils of feudal anarchy have been depicted in lurid colours by the masterly pen of Kalhaṇa. We have drawn upon him extensively to show how the centrifugal tendencies were accentuated by the feudatories of this period. Unlike the French monarchs, the Kashmirian kings were not able to destroy the castles of barons. Nor could they rally the common people round the royal banner. The townsmen of Toulouse wrote to Louis VII (1137-1180 A. D.): "After God we appeal to you as to our good master, our protector, our liberator." Never did the people of Kashmir or any other Indian state make any such appeal to their monarch.

Feudalism, in Europe, in the words of Hallam, "by preserving the mutual relations of the whole, kept alive the feeling of a common country and common duties, and settled, after the lapse of ages, into the free constitution of England the firm monarchy of France, and the federal Union of Germany<sup>162</sup>." But in India, the boundaries of almost every

state were changing so frequently that it was difficult either for the nobility or for the common people to be inspired by a sense of loyalty to the state, as distinguished from its government by a particular dynasty. Hence, feudalism did not usher in that spirit of civil liberty, which characterised the constitutional history of mediaeval England. The chief factor responsible for such a state of affairs was the failure of kings to stop the right of feudal lords to indulge in private warfare. The common people were so incessantly harassed by these wars that it became difficult, if not impossible, for them to develop that spirit of patriotism which promotes solidarity in a state.

The mediaeval monarchs of Northern India failed to put themselves at the head of common people who were continuously harassed by the feudal nobility. Had they been able to assume such leadership, it would not have been difficult to suppress the baronial anarchy. But they preferred to rely on the support of one group of feudatories in their attempt to quell the disturbances created by others. Most of the feudal chiefs were opportunists and time-servers. They did not feel any pang of conscience in deserting the cause of their hereditary overlord and transferring their allegiance to a powerful invader, who promised greater privileges to them. The old ideal of kindness to the ruling family of the conquered region, which actuated the invader not to annex the territory and to install one of its scions to subordinate rulership, became in this age a prime cause for the instability of political condition. Moreover, monarchs like Paramāra Bhoja, Kalachuri Karna, and Somēśvara Chālukya, who went out on expedition to very distant areas, had to entrust some of their capable lieutenants with the administration of certain territories as feudal vassals. The personal relation between them might have been strong enough to keep the territories together for a generation or two. But in course of time, the memory of such personal relationship faded out and the feudal rulers tended to assert their independence. The feudal structure of governance of state in mediaeval India stood in the way of

national cohesion, which could not be forged even in the face of Turko-Afghan invasions.

### REFERENCES TO CHAPTER I (FEUDALISM)

- 1 *Mānasollāsa* (GOS. Vol. 28, p. 132) *Viṃśati* II. 20 1146-1147.
- 2 *Śukranītisāra* (Cal. ed.) IV. 7. 243 ; (ed. Sarkar. IV, 7, 481)
- 3 RC (VR. ed.) Canto I.45
- 4 *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra* III. 50.
- 5 Cf. also JASB. XIX (1953) p. 105-106 for Bihar Hill Image-inscription, Year 3.
- 6 EI. VII. 98.
- 7 Jaynagar Inscr. JASB. XVII (1951) p. 29.
- 8 IHQ. XXX (1954) pp. 212-213.
- 9 *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 61-62.
- 10 DHNI, Vol. II. p. 701.
- 11 EI. XI. 68.
- 12 AIOC. 1919, p. 324.
- 13 IC. VII. p. 7.
- 14 *Struggle for Empire* pp. 66-67.
- 15 *Vikramāṅkadēvacharita*, Ch. 18. 93 and IC. VII. 14.
- 16 IA. XVIII. p. 217.
- 17 DHNI. II. p. 780.
- 18 Mahoba Inscr. EI. I. 219-220 ; Ajaigaḍh inscr. in EI.I.325 ; Prabodhachandrodaya I. 9.
- 19 Nagpur Praśasti, DHNI. Vol. II. p. 872 ; RC. I. 9.
- 20 Kauṭilya VII. 16.
- 21 Mbh, Śānti. 33. 43-46.
- 22 Manu VII. 202-203.
- 23 Viṣṇudharmasūtra III. 47-49.
- 24 Agni Purāṇa (ed. Cal.) Ch. 236. 22.
- 25 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.) IV. 7. 397-399.
- 26 Manu VII. 201-202 (trans. G. Jha).
- 27 Mbh, Śānti. 80. 3.
- 28 Kauṭilya VII. 3.
- 29 Bbh, Śānti. 87. 6-8.
- 30 Manu VII. 119 (ed. Ganganath Jha, Vol. III. pt. II. p. 355-356).
- 31 Kauṭilya II. 1.



32 Altekar and Majumdar ; *New History of the Indian People*, Vol. VI. p. 172.

33 *Classical Age* pp. 39, 40 ff.

34 *Ibid* p. 67-68.

35 *Ibid* p. 30-31.

36 PHAI (4th ed.), p. 533 ; cf. *Classical Age* p. 61.

37 *Ibid* p. 531.

38. *IHQ*. XXIV (1948) p. 72-74.

39 *HB* I. p. 52.

40 *Bh. List*. No. 1376.

41 *Ibid* No. 1741.

42 *Ibid* No. 1339.

43 *HB* I. p. 274.

44 *Ibid* p. 114 and 275.

45 *Bh. List* Nos. 1413, 1416 and 1556 ; 1561, 1567-1568 respectively.

46 *Ibid* No. 1385 and 1386.

47 *DHNI* II pp. 590, 668, 670 and 672.

48 *Ibid* I. p. 590, II. p. 1161, 1168.

49 *Ibid* I p. 594-5.

50 *Ibid* II. p. 745.

51. *Ibid* I p. 595 and II p. 1059.

52 *AR* p. 263.

53 *DHNI* II p. 849.

54 *AR* p. 265.

55 *DHNI* II p. 755.

56 *Bh List* Nos. 1385-86.

57 *Ibid* Nos. 44 and 1085.

58 *AR* p. 161.

59 *Ibid* p. 177.

60 *Bh. List* Nos. 1556, 1560, 1565, 1567-68.

61 Hallam : *View of the State of Europe During the Middle Ages* Vol. I. p. 153.

62 *On Manu* VII. 154 (ed. Ganganath Jha).

63 *Mānasollāsa* (Vol. I. p. 40) *Viñh.* II. 2. 128

64 *Śukranītisāra* IV. 7, 9, and 12 (ed. Cal.).

65 *Ibid* IV. 7, 259 (ed. Cal) ; ed. Sarkar IV. 7. 514-515.

66 The above statement is based on the interpretation of Dr. D. C. Sircar in *IC*. I. p. 680 ; but Dr. B. C. Sen in *IHQ*. X. p. 326 f.n. 11, has taken the passage to mean that he reduced his own *Sāmantas* to helplessness.

67 *RT* VIII. 21-32.

- 68 DHNI II. 919 and 925.
- 69 IA. XVII. p. 135 ff.
- 70 IA. XII (1883) p. 97.
- 71 BG I. i. p. 200 ; DHNI II. 1024-1025 and Majumdar, A. K. :  
Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 461, where the passage has been quoted  
and translated.
- 72 Śukranītisāra IV. 7. 801-809 (ed. Sarkar).
- 73 JOHRS. I. p. 297.
- 74 DHNI II. 872-73.
- 75 DV. XII. 65-76, XIII. 2.
- 76 BG. I. i. p. 185 and DHNI II. 914 and 990.
- 77 RT. VII. 218.
- 78 DHNI. II. p. 751.
- 79 Prabandhachintāmaṇi Tr. Tawney, pp. 95-6.
- 80 Bh. List No. 1744 and JOHRS I. 279.
- 81 Kōkkalla I made each of his seventeen sons a maṇḍalapati  
(DHNI II. 756-57) ; Alhaṇ and Kelhana gave fields to their brothers  
and nephews (Bh. List Nos. 310, 373, 377, 385 ; DHNI. II. 1125 and  
1183) ; Chaulukya Karna to nephew Devaprasāda (DHNI II. 963) and  
Kumārāpāla to his cousin Arjorāja (BG I. ii. p. 197-98).
- 82 Agni Purāṇa (Cal. ed) ch. 233. 14 and 24.
- 83 Śukranītisāra (ed. Sarkar) I. 691-699.
- 84 IA. XVII. p. 11.
- 85 Rājanītiratnākara (ed. Jayaswal) ch. II. p. 10.
- 86 Śukranītisāra II 333-336. cf. also II. 110-112 (ed. Sarkar)
- 87 DHNI II p. 712.
- 88 Ibid I pp. 516, 517-521, 523-25, 533, 536-538.
- 89 Ibid II. p. 715.
- 90 Koni inscr. verse 35 ; EI. XXVII. p. 283.
- 91 Rewa inscr. verses 14-15, dated 1192 A. D.
- 92 IA. XI. p. 338.
- 93 EI. XXIII p. 227-28 (Sone East Bank Cp. dated vs. 1254-  
1197 A.D.)
- 94 IA. XVIII (1889) pp. 136 and 139.
- 95 Pali Jaina inscr. dated V.S. 1201/1145 A.D. in Bh. List  
No. 264.
- 96 Nadol pl. dated V.S. 1213/1156 A.D. in Ibid No. 296.
- 97 Garra grant dated V.S. 1261/1295 A.D., DHNI II 723.
- 98 EI. XX. p. 133.
- 99 Icchawar pl. dated V.S. 1228/1171 A.D. DHNI II 715.
- 100 Examples of inter-marriages amongst feudatories are :  
Devarakshita of Pīthī marrying daughter of Mahāṇa of Aṅga (EI  
IX. 325) ; Vijayasena marrying Vilāsadevī, Śūra princes (HB I. p.

210, DHNI. I. p. 358), Ratnarāja I marrying daughter of Vajuvrman, prince of Komo-maṇḍala (DHNI II 804), Koṣṭhaka m. dtr. of Ḍāmara (R Vasanta T. VIII 2334-2337).

101 EI. XXIV p. 105.

102 RT. VIII 460, 1607.

103 HB I. p. 166.

104 RT. VIII 287, 1443-1444, 1464-1465, 1648, 1649, 3394.

105 Prabandhachintāmaṇi (Tr. Tawney) p. 72.

106 Mānasollāsa (Vol. I. p. 40), II. 2. 177.

107 Ibid (Vol. II). III. 4. 38 and IV. 1. 3.

108 Rāj. On abhiṣeka p. 10.

109 Vīramitrodaya, Rājanītiprakāśa, p. 56.

110 Brahma Purāṇa quoted in Rāj. p. 13 and also in Vīramitrodaya, Rājanītiprakāśa p. 46. In the latter text the word 'visrija' of Rāj. has been written as 'vibhajya.'

111 Ancient Accounts of India and China (ed. Renaudot) p. 79; "They dress a great quantity of rice and pour it out upon leaves of the *Monsa* in sight of the king. Then three or four hundred persons come of their own accord without the least constraint on the part of the king, and present themselves before him. After he has eaten some of this rice, he gives a little of it to each of them, as fast as they come up to him, one after another, and they eat in his presence. By the eating of this rice they all engage to burn themselves on the day the king dies, or is slain, and they punctually fulfill their promise, throwing themselves into the fire till the very last, so that no one soul of them is left behind", vide also HIED Vol. I. p. 9.

112 Tacitus : History II. 49.

113 Śukranītisāra I. 354-357.

114 Mānasollāsa (Vol. II. p. 104) II. 3.4-6.

115 RT. VIII. 1117.

116 Kankhal inscr. dated VS. 1265/1209 A.D. Bh. List No. 454.

117 Rajim inscr. (1145 A.D.) DHNI II. 809.

118 EI. XII. p. 255.

119 EI. XXVIII. p. 57.

120 Abh. p. 277-278.

121 Śukranītisāra I. 186 and 192 (ed. Cal).

122 Ibid I. 183-185 and 191; (ed. Sarkar I. 365-374).

123 RT. VIII. 1542.

124 Stein's translation in his edition of RT. Vol. II. p. 121.

125 Mbh. 12. 87. 6-8.

126 Viṣṇu 3. 7. 10.

127 Viṣṇudharmottara quoted in Vīra-Rājanīti p. 249.

128 Mānasollāsa (Vol. 28. p. 43). Virṣati II. 159-161.

- 129 Rāj. pp. 79-81.
- 130 Rājanītiratnākara (1936 ed. Jayaswal) p. 60. The quotation from Manu by Chandeśvara, is different from Lakṣmidhara.
- 131 Majumdar, Bimanbehari and Mitra, K. N: Vidyāpati, Intro. p. VII.
- 132 Rājanītiratnākara, ed. Jayaswal, p. 4.
- 133 Ibid, p. 3 (ed. Jayaswal, 1936).
- 134 Ibid p. 4.
- 135 Ibid p. 4-5.
- 136 IA. XII. (1883) p. 96; EI. XII. p. 255.
- 137 RT. ed. Stein, Vol. I. p. 133.
- 138 *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* Chittarājadeva (EI. XII. 250-268) Tejapāla (Glories of Marwar, p. 216) Āhavāmalla Bhūteyadeva (IA. XII. 96) under Chaulukyas of Anahilapāṭaka; *Mahākumāras* Lakṣmīvarmadeva, Hariśchandra Udayavarmadeva and Devapāla (IA. XVI p. 257, JASB. VII p. 737, DHNI II. p. 900) under Paramāras of Malwa; *Mahārāṇaka* Salakhanavarmadeva (IA. XVII. p. 229 and Bh. List. No. 432), *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* Prithvīdeva (DHNI II. 805 and 1000) under Kalachuris of Tripurī; Thakkura Sāhilla (IA. XVII p. 136) under Kalachuris of Ratanpur; *Rāṇaka* Puñja (JOHRS I. p. 292) under Somavarsīśis and also Mahāmahī-maṇḍaleśvara Someśvara of Kośala (EI. XXVIII p. 284).
- 139 EI. XXVIII p. 284.
- 140 EI. I. 32 ff, JOHRS I. pp. 298-300, EI. XXVIII p. 288.
- 141 State and Government in Ancient India p. 225.
- 142 EI. XXVII. pp. 119-122 (Rakshaskhali island pl. dated 1190 A. D.)
- 143 EI. XXIII. pp. 223-230 (Sone East Bank cp. dated 1197 A. D.)
- 144 EI. VII. pp. 85-93 (Kahla pl. 1031 A. D.)
- 145 DHNI. II. 925.
- 146 EI. XII. pp. 250-268 (Bhandup pl. dated 1026 A. D.)
- 147 Rāj. p. 10 and Viramitrodaya, Rājanīti. p. 56.
- 148 RT. VIII 3303.
- 149 Rājanītiratnākara I. pp. 4-5.
- 150 EI. I. p. 33, 35-36, Cf. also other examples in BG. I. i. p. 194, DHNI III. p. 1001. RT. VII. 991 and VIII. 1970.
- 151 Hallam: The Middle Ages I. p. 171. In most of the countries, including England forty days and in Jerusalem 60 days.
- 152 IHQ. XVII. pp. 210-217.
- 153 DHNI. II. 922; History of the Paramāras, p. 338.
- 154 Under (i) the Chandellas, feudatory Arjuna of Dubkund slew Rājyapāla (EI. II. p. 237); Kīrttirāja defended Gwalior against

Sultān Mahmūd and checked aggression of Bhoja (Hist. of the Paramāras p. 106 and IA. XV. p. 36, 42-43). (ii) the Kalachuris of Tripurī and Ratanpur, feudatories Kamalarāja defeated the King of Utkala (EI. XIX. p. 79). Malayasiṃha subjugated the rebellion of another feudatory of Karkkaredikā (MASI. p. 135). Sāhilla's son and grandsons conquered Bhaṭṭavīla and Vihāra, Daṇḍora and Koma-maṇḍala (IA. XVII. pp. 136-38). Vallabharāja and Brahmadeva defeated a Gauḍa king and Jāṭeśvara Kāmārṇava, son of Anantavarman Choḍagaṅga respectively (EI. XXVII p. 279 and XXVI pp. 257-260). (iii) the Chaulukyas of Gujarat, feudatories fought against Graharipu of Saurāṣṭra (Dvyāśraya, V) Malava and Saurāṣṭra (EI. IX. 70, 72 and 76.) Koṅkana (EI. VIII p. 211-212) Chāhamāna King Aṇa (Dvāśraya IX) and Guhila King Sāmantasīṃha (EI. VIII 211).

155 RT. VIII 2505, 2741.

156 IA. 1888, p. 229.

157 MASI, 1931, p. 134; IA XVII. p. 229.

158 Thakkuras Śrī Sujāna under Mahānrpati Indradhavalā of Japila (Sone East Bank cp. EI. XXIII. pp. 223-230). Udayasīṃha under Mahārājaka Harirājadeva in Chandella Km. (Rewa inscr. IA. XVII p. 236), Mahāditya and Silhana under Kirttivarman of Karkkaredikā in Kalachuri Km. (Rewa inscr. IA. XVII p. 226). Vāchchhuka and Rāsala under Mahākumāra Hariśchandra (Bhopal pl. EI. XXIV. p. 227) in Malwa, Rājadeva under Rāyapāla of Naḍḍūla (Nadlai SI. DHNI. II. 1203), Pethaḍa under Rāyapāla of Naddula (Nadol inscr. EI. XI. 41), Khelāditya under Alhaṇadeva of Nadol (Kiradu SI. DHNI. II. 979-80), the two Kalaśarājas under Lehara and Rājapuri chieftains in Kashmir (RT. VII. 1040, 1045 and 1267-1294)

159 Belkhara SI. (DHNI. I. 545). Dohad inscr. (IA. X. 159). Kalvan pl. (EI. XIX. 72).

160 RT. VIII. 2319-2330.

161 Agni Purāṇa (Cal. ed) ch. 233. V. 14; Cf. also verse 24 and Vīramitrodaya, Rājanītiprakāśa p. 277.

162 Rewa inscr. dated KS. 963, (EI. XXV. p. 4).

163 IA. XVII. pp. 230-236.

164 DV. 19. 98. (Kṛtyau bibheda sāmantau nāmnā vijayakṛṣṇakau)

165 Majumdar, A. K. Chaulukyas of Gujarat p. 105-106.

166 I have pointed out in my article in PIHC, 1946, p. 192-193 that I do not agree to the meaning of Ḍāmara as "riotous, rebel" given in the St. Petersburg Dictionary Vol. III p. 125. Some of the Ḍāmaras like Bimba (RT. 7. 1630) supported the King. Thus they could not have been in a state of perpetual rebellion against all

rulers. Further, the Dāmaras were always seeking opportunities of establishing themselves in power.

167 Wilson: *An Essay on the Hindu History of Cashmir*, pp. 51-70.

168 RT. VII. 1236-37, VIII 90, 591, 627 and 1127, VIII 2009 and 2012, VIII 1682, 1707, 2730, 2740 and 3284.

169 RT. IV. 347-48.

170 Ibid. VIII. 495-96.

171 Ibid. VIII. 706-710.

172 Ibid. VII. 159; VIII. 38; VII. 266; VII. 1022; VII. 1172-73; VIII. 995; VIII. 1306-1307; VIII. 522; VII. 1630-31; VIII. 424; VIII. 202; VII. 223, 1240 and VIII 40; VII. 1240; VIII. 41, 723; VII. 1254; VII. 1228 and VIII. 733; VIII. 651; VII. 1022, VIII. 591, 1517, 2749; VIII, 425.

173 Ibid. V. 57.

174 Ibid. VII. 1360.

175 Ibid VII 1254, VIII 648, 929, 1070, 1124, 1153, 2505.

176 Stein in RT. Vol. II. pp. 458-60, 467-68 and 470.

178 Majumdar, B. p : *Role of Dāmaras in PIHC*. 1946 (Patna Session). pp. 196 ff.

177 RT. VII. 119.

179 Ibid. VII. 967-91.

180 Ibid. VIII 537-52.

180 Ibid. VIII. 537-52.

181 Ibid. VIII. 885-87, 914.

182 Hallam : *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, Vol. I p. 269.

## CHAPTER II

### The Military System and its effects.

#### *Hereditary army and feudalism*

Feudal principles permeated the social organisation of Northern India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The social status of a person was not unoften determined by the quantity of land held by him as also by the number of persons, who were dependent on him. This is illustrated by the position of the *maula* (hereditary) army, which was the main prop of the King both in offensive and defensive wars. Various writers on state-craft, from Kautilya to Chanḍeśvara, speak of the hereditary army, but none of them clearly explain the sense in which the army is regarded as hereditary. Did the son of a soldier invariably succeed to the office of his father, irrespective of his mental and physical aptitude? If a soldier had a dozen sons, did the king recruit each and every one of them? Was there no limit to the size of the *maula* force? We do not get any direct answer to any of these questions from the ancient and mediaeval authorities, but we can draw certain conclusions from a few stray hints given by some of these writers. Kautilya<sup>1</sup> records his preference of hereditary army over the five other types of armies on the grounds that they depend on the king for maintenance, are being constantly drilled and receive constant favour from the King. Dr. Kane<sup>2</sup> surmises that "they most probably consisted of persons, who and whose ancestors got tax-free lands in lieu of military service." The relation between the King and individual soldiers appears to have been a direct one in the days of Kautilya. But in the twelfth century A.D. it tended to become an indirect one as is evidenced by Mānasollāsa<sup>3</sup>, which states that the King should make sumptuous provision for the maintenance of the chiefs of the hereditary army by bestowing upon them a village or two or, at times, more villages. The King granted

villages to a number of army chiefs, who in their turn must have bestowed land upon the families of individual soldiers. These soldiers cultivated the land either personally or through others on the basis of crop-sharing. There was nothing incongruous in the joining of the profession of arms with that of cultivation as even in the time of Kauṭilya<sup>1</sup> there were Corporations of Kṣatriyas and others in Kambhoja and Surāṣṭra, who were *vārtāsastropajivinaḥ* or followers of the profession of husbandry and trade as well as of arms.

*Brāhmaṇas and other castes joining military profession*

According to the orthodox theory of the four *varṇas* the profession of arms is the close preserve of the Kṣatriyas. This theory has led scholars like Prof. Habib<sup>5</sup> to think that the Bhāhmaṇas did not join the military profession. As a matter of fact, the military profession was adopted by many of the Brāhmaṇas from the days of the epics, if not earlier. The most notable instances are Droṇa and Kripa of the Mahābhārata. The teachers or predecessors of Kauṭilya gave preference to the Brāhmaṇa army over the Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra armies. But Kauṭilya<sup>6</sup> holds that a Brāhmaṇa may be won over by the enemy by making an obeisance before him. He goes further and states that, if an army of Vaiśyas and Śūdras be fairly sizable or, if there is an army of well-trained Kṣatriyas, it is better than a Brāhmaṇa army. This shows that the profession of arms was not closed to the castes other than Kṣatriyas. This is also corroborated by the evidence of the Sukranītisāra,<sup>7</sup> which states that the caste does not determine the quality of soldiers. They may be Śūdras, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, *Mlechchhas* or of mixed castes, but they must be brave, self-disciplined, well-built, devoted to their master and their *Dharma* and actuated by a feeling of hatred towards the enemy. Kāmandaka,<sup>8</sup> however, holds that the hereditary army should consist mainly, though not exclusively, of Kṣatriyas.

The Commander-in-Chief, according to the Agni-Purāṇa<sup>9</sup> and Matsya Purāṇa,<sup>10</sup> must either be a Brāhmaṇa or a



Kṣatriya. The Śukranītisāra categorically states that a valiant Kṣatriya should be preferred as a Commander-in-Chief; but if such a person be not available, a Brāhmaṇa may be so selected. He is definitely against the selection of a Śūdra as a Commander-in-Chief<sup>11</sup>. Epigraphic and literary evidences of our period conclusively prove the adoption of military career by castes other than the Kṣatriyas. Illustrious examples of Brāhmaṇa warriors are Guravamiśra and Vaidya-deva,<sup>12</sup> ministers of the Pāla Kings Nārāyaṇapāla and Kumarpāla respectively, Māṇḍalika Vanapati,<sup>13</sup> Gopāla,<sup>14</sup> Aiyaka, Kalyāṇarāja, Ojānanda and Yaśorāja<sup>15</sup>. Hemachandra tells us that the army of Aṇa, Rājā of Sapādalakṣa, was led by the Brāhmaṇa general Rāka<sup>16</sup>. According to Kalhana, the Kāyasthas of Kashmir took up the profession of soldiers<sup>17</sup>. The Rāmacharita shows that the Kaivartas were valiant warriors. These evidences go to show that whatever might have been the theory of the *varṇāśrama-dharma*, the military profession was not the exclusive monopoly of a single caste. But it was not the bounden duty of every citizen to take up arms in defence of one's country. No state in mediaeval India ever tried to enforce conscription.

### *Types of troops*

Besides the *maula* (hereditary) army, the King had to depend largely upon the Bhṛta or hired soldiers. The *maula* army depended for their subsistence on the land-grants of the King. They had to be collected from all parts of the state. The hired soldiers, according to Kautilya<sup>18</sup>, "were stationed near at hand, and always ready to march." Such troops rallied round the banner of a *Vijigīṣu* or conquering king, with the hope of getting a large share of the booty. They had not, however, any hereditary attachment to the king. When they found the balance of war tipped against their employer, they did not hesitate to desert his cause. This is why the hereditary army was preferred to the hired army. Somadeva, in his *Nītivākyaṃṛita*, definitely states that the

*maula* army does not rebel and cannot be won over by enemies.

The third type of army, which a king enlisted, was called the *Śreṇī* or guild levies. Some of these guilds must have been Corporations of soldiers. Others were economic guilds, which maintained armies for the protection of their life and property. These were drawn upon by the king at the time of his need. Kauṭilya states that these are better than the allied troops, because they "belong to the same country as the King and have the same expectations of loss and gain." The *Agni Purāṇa*<sup>19</sup>, *Kāmandaka Nītisāra*<sup>20</sup> and *Nītivākya-mṛita*<sup>21</sup> follow Kauṭilya in showing preference to *maula*, *bhṛita*, *śreṇī* and *mītra* troops in the order in which they are mentioned here. But the *Mānasollāsa*<sup>22</sup> speaks of *maula*, *bhṛita* and *mītra* army as the three best in order of preference and condemns the guild levy as untrustworthy. The fourteenth-century Mithila scholar-statesman Chanḍeśvara explains the cause of not preferring the *śreṇībala*, which according to him, receive payment for their services but flee from the battlefield whenever they find their life in danger.

The fourth source from which a king used to draw his army was the *mītra* forces. In the Maliya copper-plate of Dharasena II, dated 571-72 A.D. there is reference to the establishment of the Valabhī dynasty by Bhatārka with the assistance of the *maula*, *bhṛita*, *mītra* and *śreṇī* troops<sup>23</sup>. The exact significance of the term *mītra* cannot be definitely ascertained. According to the *Maṇḍala* theory, he who is separated from the conquering king by the intervention of the kingdom of *ari* (in the immediate neighbourhood) is a *mītra*. A fully sovereign king will not normally place his army under the command of another king. He may, however, combine with a friendly power to bring about defeat or humiliation of a common enemy. The unreliability of the *mītra-bala* is illustrated by many instances in our period. Harivarman, the ally of the Kaivarta King Bhīma, went over to the side of Rāmapāla, on being paid a large

sum of money by the latter's son<sup>24</sup>. The allied powers at Dhārā separated themselves soon after the death of Bhoja, the Paramāra King. Hemachandra and Merutuṅga refer to the quarrels between the Chaulukya King Bhīma I and the Kalachuri King Karṇa. In course of narrating the events after the fall of Dhārā, Merutuṅga tells us that the feeling between the allies ran so high that Dāmara, the ambassador of Bhīma "entered the royal pavillion with thirty-two foot-soldiers and took Karṇa prisoner, when he was asleep in the middle of the day."<sup>25</sup>

Besides these four, the writers on state-craft refer to two other kinds of armies, namely *a-mitrabala* and *aṭavī-bala*. The former, according to Mānasollāsa<sup>26</sup> consists of soldiers, who once belonged to an enemy king but being defeated were taken captive and made slaves. Instances of slaves enrolled as soldiers in times of emergency are not unknown in history. But such troops are a constant source of danger and annoyance. Kauṭilya says that the common characteristic of these two types is that both are "anxious for plunder". This does not indicate that in his time, the *amitra-bala* consisted of slaves. The Rājanītiratnākara<sup>27</sup> defines *aribala* as "troops that come to a king after leaving the king's enemy." Chanḍeśvara<sup>28</sup> rightly observes that a king accepts such troops only with a view to securing the enfeeblement of the power of the enemy and as such no confidence should be placed in them. The *aṭavī-bala*, consisting of persons living in the mountainous country as well as of Niṣādas and *mlechchhas*, was the worst type of troops, according to Mānasollāsa.

The six types of troops, described above, demonstrate the heterogenous character of the army of Indian Kings. With such an army it was difficult to undertake a long and arduous expedition but more hazardous still to offer resistance to an invading army. The size of the standing army was usually small as the king depended largely on the feudal contingents, which constituted the bulk of the hereditary or *maula* army. Reliance had to be placed on the hired army,

because the strength of the hereditary army alone was not sufficient for a successful expedition. According to the *Mānasollāsa*<sup>29</sup> the hired soldiers were reviewed by the King every day and were paid wages daily, monthly, quarterly, every four or six months according to terms of contract.

The hired soldiers were recruited from various regions. The Pāla and Sena inscriptions refer to troops recruited from Mālava, Khaṣa, Hūṇa, Kulika, Kaṇṇāṭa and Lāṭa countries<sup>30</sup>. Kalhaṇa speaks of Khaṣas in Kashmir and of the recruitment of mercenaries from Rajputana, Saindhava regions and Rajagriha in Magadha<sup>31</sup>. The Kashmirian kings did not hesitate to recruit even Yavana soldiers<sup>32</sup>. King Haṛṣa of Kashmir (1089-1101 A. D.) employed Turuṣka troop leaders and showed great favours to them<sup>33</sup>. Chaṇḍeśvara echoes the opinion of Manu<sup>34</sup> who says that the soldiers from Kurukṣetra, Matsya, Pāñchāla and Surasena being noted for their bravery, should be placed in the vanguard of the army<sup>35</sup>.

Kalhaṇa records the employment of a large number of Rājaputras in the Kashmirian army. They had such distinctive features that they could be easily told as foreigners from the Kashmirians<sup>36</sup>. They were employed by the Kashmirian Kings like Saṃgrāmarāja, Uchchala, Sussala and Jayasinha<sup>37</sup>. In 1111 A. D., like the Swiss guards during the French Revolution, a Rājaputra from Champa\* bravely faced death in overpowering the assailants of King Uchchala. Other Rājaputra soldiers saved Sussala's capital from the attacks of Prithvīhara, the rebel *Dāmara* in 1122 A. D. They are also known to have accompanied the Kings in marching against Lahara and Pañchigrāma in 1130 and 1144 A. D. We come across only one instance of their cowardice when they fled while Utpala was murdering King Sussala<sup>38</sup>.

\* This Champā (is neither the Champā of Bhagalpur district, nor the island in the Indian archipelago) has been indentified by Stein with the region in the valleys of the sources of the Rāvi between Kangra, the ancient Trīgarta and Kāṣṭhavāṭa (RT. Vol. II. p. 431-432).

We get some idea of the dress of the soldiers of mediaeval India from the *Abhidhānachintāmaṇi* of Hemachandra. Soldiers were heavily clad with helmet and iron nets protecting separately the belly, thighs, arms and other parts of the body<sup>39</sup>. Somadeva, in his *Yaśastilakachampū*, has given a pen-picture of the dress, weapons, habits and deportment of the cavalry of Northern India, archers from Gurjaradeśa and soldiers of Trihuta and of Gauḍa. The North Indian regiment is described as "of truthful speech, and eloquent in praise of the speed of horses. The men have bodies, comely as heated gold, and held fast in their hands knives, darts, daggers, spears, blades and bows. The surface of the earth shakes under the hooves of their horses, galloping at top speed, so peculiar was their mode of riding. They wore *pug-grees* made up with multi-coloured scarves arranged in layers; and with the crown of their heads adorned with clusters of flowers of endless varieties, they look like the sylvan abode of the goddess of victory."<sup>40</sup> Dressed in this fashion the North Indian horse-soldiers certainly looked picturesque; but it may be questioned whether such a dress, and especially the decorative flowers were conducive to their efficiency as fighters. If they had in their hands simultaneously the "knives, darts, daggers, spears, blades and bows", they could hardly move any of these to strike the enemy. Probably different soldiers or platoons had different weapons.

Somadeva speaks very highly of the valour and military exercises gone through by the Tirhut regiment. They are said to be devoted to "manœuvres incidental to naval combats." The mighty rivers, Ganges, Gaṇḍaka, Sarayū and Nāgamatī must have afforded them ample opportunity for practising naval warfare. They had also very big contingents of elephants with them. But it must be noted that one cannot fight simultaneously with boats and elephants. As a matter of fact the two are absolutely incongruous.

The Gauḍa soldiers are described in none too favourable words by Somadeva. These soldiers had on their head

“extremely long tufts of hair. The extremities of their teeth are worn out by constant munching of flattened rice and their mouths are tinged red with betel; they are by nature exceedingly irascible, and hurl abuses at the bystanders, when put to shame for stumbling on account of their cloak reaching down to the feet. The large shields of the regiment made from multicoloured cords have tinged the entire expanse of the sky with diverse hues.” If the Gauda soldiers really donned such long robes, they could not have shown the agility of movement which is essential in battle-fields. Their habit of chewing betel leaves also affected their efficiency as adversely as did the wearing of flowers on the turbans by the North Indian cavalry regiment. The Gujarat regiments were more practical in their dress, as it reached only down to their knees. They were armed with bows, and their loins were girt with daggers with buffalo-horn hilts. The poet is certainly using a hyperbole when he states that “the existence of, certain portions of their bodies, the navel, eyes and the ears, can only be inferred from their actions, owing to their beards expanding thickly downwards and sidewise”. They are described as swift in aiming, vigorous in shooting and accurate at hitting, distant targets.<sup>41</sup> But it was not difficult for a desperate enemy to pull them and the Gauda soldiers, by the overflowing beards or hairs! There is certainly poetic exaggeration in the description of soldiers given by Somadeva, but the point that emerges clearly from it is that the Indian soldiers of this age were more keen on making their appearance picturesque and colourful than on securing efficiency as warriors. There was hardly any uniformity in dress or weapons amongst the soldiers coming from different parts of the country.

The rigidity of the caste system did not allow the soldiers of a single army to have their food together. They could not be readily refreshed with food and drink in the battle-front. If the battle continued to rage till late in the afternoon, the Hindu soldiers were often found to be famishing for food.

*Constituents of the army*

Conventionally the four-fold constituents of the Indian army were the infantry, cavalry, elephants and chariots. Following the precepts of older writers, the Agni Purāṇa<sup>42</sup> and the Śukranītisāra state that the King should have in the army a preponderance of foot-soldiers, a medium quantity of horse, a small quantity of elephant force, equal number of bulls and camels, but never elephants in excess. Bhoja<sup>44</sup> explicitly writes that the foot soldiers are the main source of strength on all occasions.

In earlier times, the proportion of infantry to cavalry was 3 : 5, as is borne out by the evidence of the Mahābhārata, Ādiparva<sup>45</sup> and the lexicon Vaijayantī<sup>46</sup> in definition of *patti*. But in later times as it became increasingly difficult to secure good horses from the Sindhu and Afghan regions, which fell into the hands of the Arabs, the proportion was raised to 1 : 1000. The Nītiprakāśikā states that each horseman was supported by a thousand foot-soldiers.<sup>47</sup> The Indian writers on statecraft, however, were keenly alive to the importance of the cavalry. Somadeva, in his Nītivākyāmr̥ita writes: "with a King, having a strong cavalry force, war becomes almost a sport. Fortune smiles on him and the enemies stationed even at a long distance come within his grasp."<sup>48</sup> Someśvara Chālukya also gives similar importance to cavalry in his Mānasollāsa, which states that the cavalry is the key to fame : a King in possession of a strong cavalry need entertain no apprehension regarding his territory.<sup>49</sup>

In ancient times India used to import the best horses from Arabia and Persia and also to purchase them from the countries, which are now called Afghanistan and Western Pakistan. The Mahābhārata refers to the horses from Kamboja, Gāndhāra and Bālhika countries<sup>50</sup>. The Jaina Uttarā-dhyāyana Sūtra,<sup>51</sup> Sumaṅgalavilāsini<sup>52</sup> and Harṣacharita<sup>53</sup> also refer to the commendable qualities of the Kamboja horses. The latter work also speaks of horses from Vanāyu, Āraṭṭa,

Bhāradvāja, Sindh and Persia. The Yuktikalpataru<sup>54</sup> refers to the horses from Tājikistān and Tuṣāra countries as the best and the Sindhu horses as inferior ones. The Mānasollāsa, however, says that the Sindhu horses trained by the Yavanas are the best.<sup>55</sup> The Śārṅgadharapaddhati<sup>56</sup> classifies the horses born in Kīra (N. Punjab), Turuṣka, Āraṭṭa, Takka, Sindhus as of medium quality. The rise of the Arabs to great military power in Persia and Western Asia, their occupation of Sind and the extinction of the power of the Shāhiyas in Afghanistan and the Punjab made it extremely difficult for the Indian princes to secure good horses. The only breed, which was tolerably good and was available to them was Surastra horses.<sup>57</sup> The Indian horses could not stand comparison with the Turkoman horses\* on which the Turko-Afghans came to invade India.

### *Elephants*

Elephants played a prominent part in warfare from very early times.<sup>58</sup> Megasthenes states that elephants were trained for war in India and often turned the scale of victory.<sup>59</sup> The elephants accompanied the vanguards of the army, cleared the road by removing trees and shrubs and battered the walls and gates of fortresses.<sup>60</sup> Two verses quoted in the anthology, Śārṅgadharapaddhati, show that it was believed that elephants increased the grandeur of the power of a king<sup>61</sup> and that their use assured victory.<sup>62</sup> Kauṭilya asserts that the destruction of

\*The Turkoman horse "according to the Cambridge Mediaeval History (Vol. I. p. 331) "is the noblest in the whole of Central Asia, and surpasses all other breeds in speed, endurance, intelligence, faithfulness and a marvellous sense of locality. The Turkoman horse is tall, with a long narrow body, long thin legs and neck... On their predatory expeditions, the Turkomans cover 650 miles in the waterless desert in five days. They owe their powers to the training of thousands of years in the endless steppes and deserts, and to the continual plundering raids, which demanded the utmost endurance and privation of which horse and rider were capable."



the enemy's army depends on elephants. But the defeat of Indian kings in many crucial battles at the hands of foreigners was primarily due to the uncontrollable movement of war-elephants. These historical examples led Somadeva to sound a note of caution about the use of these unwieldy mounts in war. He observes that if the elephants are not properly trained and guided to action, they bring disasters, and even death to the king who uses them.<sup>63</sup> The wisdom of this observation is proved by several recorded instances in our period. In the battle of Kṣiptikā, the supporters of the pretender Uchchhala, shot arrows at the elephants of King Harṣa and these in their agony trampled down their own force.<sup>64</sup> The rebel Kaivarta chief Bhīma, was also defeated by Rāmapāla because the elephant carrying him was "disgracefully panic-stricken" and was easily captured.<sup>65</sup> Śukra advises the restriction of the number of elephants even for transport purposes to the barest minimum. According to him, a King should have bulls 1/5th, camels 1/8th and elephants 1/32nd of the total strength of the cavalry.<sup>66</sup> In actual practice, however, we find considerable numbers of elephants being engaged by the Hindu kings in their fights against the Turko-Afghans. Ānandapāla could have probably achieved victory in 1008 A.D., had he not used elephants. His enemies discharged arrows and naphtha balls against the elephants. The elephant carrying Ānandapāla, having been struck, became unruly and fled away.<sup>67</sup> The Hindu army, thinking that the king was retreating from the battlefield became panicky and dispersed. Again sometime after 1194 A. D., the King of Banaras was also defeated by Qutbuddīn almost under similar circumstances.<sup>68</sup>

Dr. B. P. Sinha<sup>69</sup> contends that had the elephant been considered the cause of the defeat of the army using it, the Turko-Afghans would not have cared to demand a tribute of elephants from the Hindu Kings. The real reason, however, for such a demand was that the elephant was a grand animal and its possession was considered a matter of prestige with them. Though they received elephants and tributes, yet we do not

come across a single instance of any Turko-Afghan invader ever using any elephant force in war.

Scholars like Dr. Altekar, Dikshitar and Chakravarti hold that chariots ceased to be used in warfare from the eighth century A. D.<sup>70</sup> The *Mānasollāsa* does not mention it as a constituent of war, nor does any Muslim writer or Indian inscription refer to it. But the *Yuktikalpataru*, *Kṛtyakalpataru*, *Rājanītiratnākara* and *Śukranītisāra* refer to chariots.<sup>71</sup> We find at least one instance of the use of chariots in war in this period. The Varman King conciliated Rāmapāla by offering his own chariots in the war against Bhima<sup>72</sup>.

We do not find any positive evidence of the use of air-force in war during our period. But a contemporary writer, Bhojadeva devotes about one hundred *śloka*s in his *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra* to aeroplanes.<sup>73</sup> These aeroplanes, according to him, could move on all sides, namely, in oblique direction, upwards, downwards, frontwise, sideways, etc.<sup>74</sup> They could move in the heaven and also on the earth<sup>75</sup>. These aerial cars were shaped like elephants, birds, monkeys, horses and chariots. Their body was made of light wood, and iron, lead, copper and other metals were used for construction of various parts of the aeroplane.<sup>76</sup> It is distinctly stated that the body of the plane was filled with mercury and fire at the bottom.<sup>77</sup> It had two wings, which were propelled by air. It is also stated to have carried passengers.<sup>78</sup>

Prof. Dikshitar holds that the aeroplane was actually used in warfare, and observes : "such elaborate descriptions ought to meet the criticism that the *vimānas* and similar vehicles mentioned in ancient Indian literature should be relegated to the region of myth."<sup>79</sup> In spite of this assertion we have grave doubts about their actual use. Bhojadeva states that the secret of the construction of the machine should not be made public and that is why details of the mechanism of the aeroplanes were not being given.<sup>80</sup>

The Navy did not constitute a regular feature of the military organisation of all the North Indian princes of the ele-

venth and twelfth centuries, though it played an important role in some of the countries. Boats are known to have been in use in India from the age of the *R̥gveda*<sup>81</sup>. The Yuktikalpataru broadly classifies boats into two types namely, *dirghā* (long) and *unnatā* (high). The *dirghā* type consisted of the following varieties viz., *dirghikā*, *ioraṇī lolā*, *gatvarā*, *gāminī*, *tarī*, *junghālā*, *plāvinī*, *dhāriṇī*, and *veginī*. Of these *lolā*, *gāminī* and *plāvinī* caused much misery. The *unnatā* type had the following varieties: *ūrdhvā*, *anūrdhvā*, *svarṇamukhī*, *garbhīnī* and *mantharā*. These vessels had their cabins towards the prows. They were made of wood, iron and brass.<sup>82</sup>

These boats were used for civil as well as military purposes. The Yuktikalpataru plainly declares that the King, who has boats, wins war, and the King, who, through ignorance, does not keep boats, loses his prestige, vigour and treasury<sup>83</sup>. Mediaeval writers also refer to the use of boats in warfare. In the naval engagement with Sultān Mahmūd in 417 A. H./1026 A. D., the Jats who had molested the invader's army on his way back from the expedition to Somanatha, employed a large number of boats. Nizāmuddīn Ahmad tells us that the Jats "launched, according to some, four, and according to others, eight thousand boats, manned and armed, ready to engage the Muhammedans<sup>84</sup>." The Jats, however, were defeated in the encounter. Alberuni also refers to pirates of Kacch and Somanath, who used ships called *vīra*<sup>85</sup>. We have already quoted a passage from the Yaśastilakachampū, showing how the Tīrhut regiment had regular practises in naval manoeuvres.<sup>86</sup>

Contemporary inscriptions too refer to naval battles. In Bengal there was an officer called *naubalavyāpṛitaka*<sup>87</sup>. During the Sena period the Bengal fleet proceeded on a conquering expedition" up the whole course of the Ganges<sup>88</sup>." The Kamauli plate of Vaidyadeva also records his naval victory in the Anuttara Vaṅga. The use of boats for military purposes in Kashmir is also testified to by Kalhaṇa.<sup>89</sup>

*Strength of the Indian army*

It is difficult to ascertain the exact strength of the army of any of the North Indian states during the period. The Sukranītisāra informs us that even an ordinary King, with an income of one lakh *Karṣas*, kept the following number of soldiers and equipments, viz. 100 in reserved force, 300 infantry with *laghunālika* firearms, 80 horses, one chariot, two *brihannālika* firearms, 10 camels, two elephants, two carts and 16 bulls<sup>90</sup>. Foreign writers either exaggerate or make conflicting statements regarding the total strength of the army of any state. With regard to the number of elephants in the Pāla army, Sulaiman states it as 50,000 and Ibn Khurdāsoh<sup>91</sup> as only 5,000. Similarly, while Nizāmuddin records that the army of Gaṇḍa Chandella consisted of 36,000 horses, 1,45,000 foot soldiers and 390 elephants, Firishta informs us that it consisted of 45,000 foot soldiers, 36,000 horses and 640 elephants. It is interesting to record that the Kharataragachchhapaṭṭāvalī tells us that Priṭhvīrāja III had a cavalry force of 70,000 soldiers<sup>92</sup>. But Firishta states that the above-mentioned Chāhamāna King rallied such a huge number as 2,00,000 and 3,00,000 horses against Muizz-ud-dīn Muhammad Ghūrī in 1191 and 1192 A. D. respectively.

The *patti* was the lowest unit in the military organisation. So far as the higher units of the army were concerned it appears that they consisted of much larger number in the days of the composition of the Nītiprakāśikā, as compared to that of the Mahābhārata. The Mahābhārata gives different tables for the various divisions of the army. By way of illustration, we may refer to the table, mentioned in the Ādiparva (2. 19. 22), according to which a *senāmukha* consisted of three chariots, three elephants, nine horses and 15 foot soldiers and an *akṣauhini* (the biggest division) of 21, 870 chariots, and same number of elephants, 65,610 horses and 109,350 infantry. But the Nītiprakāśikā<sup>93</sup> prescribes the following larger number in *senāmukha*, composed of three

chariots, 30 elephants, 3,000 horses, and 3,00,000 foot soldiers and in the biggest division, namely, *akṣauhiṇī* of 21,870 chariots, 2,18,700 elephants, 21,87,000 horses and 21,87,000,000 infantry. Thus, though the number of chariots did not increase at all, yet elephants increased ten times, cavalry 333 times and infantry 20,000 times probably in the eleventh century A. D. The vastness of the Indian army can also be realised from the *Śukranītisāra*\*. The *Purāṇanprabandhasaṁgraha*<sup>54</sup> states that Prithivīrāja III engaged three lakhs of infantry, in the second battle of Tarain in 1192 A. D.

### *Larger expenditure on army*

The increase in the size of the army naturally caused a larger expenditure of state revenues for military purposes. Śukra states that a feudatory spent 24 per cent of his income for these, but a Nṛpa having an income of one lakh *Karṣas* devoted as much as 53 per cent<sup>55</sup>. It is highly unlikely that any state atle was actually guided by these precepts. But this much is certain that the major portion of the in-

\* Calculation made on the basis of soldiers maintained by a ruler with income of one lakh *Karsas* as given in the *Śukranītisāra* IV. 7. 22-24 (ed. Cal.)

Status of king.	Reserves	Infantry	Horses	Char-	Can-	Elephants
						-lots non.
Nripati with <i>Karṣa</i> income 1 lakh.	100	300	80	1	2	
Māṇḍalika with <i>Karṣa</i> income 3 to 10 lakhs.	300	900	240	3	6	
Rājā, with <i>Karṣa</i> income 10 to 50 lakhs.	1000	3000	800	10	20	20
Svarāṭ, with <i>Karṣa</i> income 50 to 1 crore.	5000	15000	4000	50	100	100
Samrāṭ, with <i>Karṣa</i> income 1 to 10 crores.	10000	30000	8000	100	200	200
Virāt, with <i>Karṣa</i> income 10 to 50 crores.	100000	300000	80000	1000	2000	2000

come of each state was spent on military organisation, which, however, was not defensive in character. An expedition to a neighbouring state was a normal feature of the life of the time.

Feudatories, allies, adventurers, desperadoes rallied round the banner of a king going out on a conquering raid mainly in the hope of getting a rich booty. The soldiers were allowed a portion of the spoils of war from the time of Manusmṛiti, if not earlier. Manu<sup>96</sup> allows soldiers to take chariots, elephants, umbrellas, grains, animals and women as spoils of war. Commenting on this, Medhātithi observes: The King being the master of all, he might take away all the spoils of war; hence the text mentions a few exceptions. Gold, silver, lands, buildings etc. accrue to the King, hence the necessity of enumerating those that do not go to him. Arms and conveyances also accrue to the king.... It is in view of all this that there is the popular saying—"Half belongs to the king". The soldiers shall of their own accord, present to the king their best object and they shall not take all the booty themselves<sup>97</sup>." This shows that there was considerable relaxation of the rule regarding the booty at the time of Medhātithi. There was now a moral appeal to the soldiers not to take all they could seize and to give something, according to their own choice, to the king. Lakṣmīdhara, the minister of the Gāhaḍavāla King Govindachandra, quotes with approval the above-mentioned passage of Manu and also the views of Gautama<sup>98</sup>, which however, were not unanimous. Gautama did not allow soldiers to retain chariots and beasts of burden, which had to be given to the king. Manu definitely states that gold and silver looted during the battle belong to the king. Śukra categorically negatives the opinion of Manu and holds that "silver, gold or other booty belongs to him who wins it"<sup>99</sup> He further exhorts the ruler "to satisfy the troops by giving them those things with pleasure, according to the labour undergone." This is a counsel of perfection, because

the question of giving to the soldier does not arise unless he has made over to the king the booty seized. Medhātithi, therefore, appears to be more practical than Śukra in this matter.

### *Offensive Weapons*

Coming to the question of the weapons of war, we find that there was no new invention in arms during the last thousand years. The soldiers were using those very weapons, which were utilised in the period of the epics, early Smritis and the Gupta emperors. Some of these were, bows made of wood and horn,<sup>100</sup> arrows and specially iron-made arrows called *nārāchas*,<sup>101</sup> swords,<sup>102</sup> *kunta*,<sup>103</sup> *tomara*,<sup>104</sup> *prāsa*,<sup>105</sup> *bhindipāla*,<sup>106</sup> *gadā*<sup>107</sup> or mace, *paraśu*<sup>108</sup> or battle-axe, *pāśa*<sup>109</sup> or noose, *chakra*<sup>110</sup> or disc, *śūla*<sup>111</sup> *parigha*<sup>112</sup> etc. Yantras, which were installed in fortresses and used for throwing stones, were in use as early as the days of the epics.<sup>113</sup> They were also used in mediaeval India.<sup>114</sup> Such was the efficiency of these catapults, that Bhoja remarks humorously that they can do everything that is possible to imagine and can even make a person dance or take part in a drama.<sup>115</sup>

The mediaeval writers have thoroughly discussed the relative quality of swords manufactured in Northern India. The Agni Purāṇa<sup>116</sup> observes that "swords manufactured in Khaṭi or Khaṭṭara country are noted for their good appearance, those produced in Rīṣika for their quickness in cutting things, those in Sūrpāraka for strength, in Aṅga for sharpness and Vaṅga for keenness and durability." An altogether different list of location of this industry is mentioned in the Śārṅgadharapaddhati, according to which, light and sharp swords were made in Madhyamagrāma and Sahagrāma, and smooth sharp and faultless steel in the Chedi country.<sup>117</sup> A third list is furnished by Bhoja,<sup>118</sup> who mentions the relative quality of the swords manufactured in Banaras, Magadha, Nepal, Aṅga, Kaliṅga and Surāstra. The first and the last mentioned

countries manufactured the best sword. Those produced in Maghadha, Aṅga and Kāśī were the worst.

Some weapons, used in ancient India, went out of use in the period under survey. Dikshitar points out that the following missiles, which were used in ancient times, are not mentioned in the *Nītiprakasika*, e.g., *Brahmasirsa*, *sikhari*, *śuṣka*, *ādra*, *sikharastra*, *vidyāstra*, *śoṣaṇam*, *prasvāpana*, *nāmana*, *tāmasa*, *saṃvarta*, *saura*, *māyāstra*, *tvāṣṭra*, *somāstra*, *saṃhāra*, *mānasa*, *nāgāstra*, *garuḍāstra* and *śaiveśika*<sup>119</sup>. Similarly, *hātaka* (rod with three or four edges), *varāhakarna* (rod with bear's earshape), *kaṇāya*, (metallic rod with triangular ends), *kārpana* (a kind of arrow), which are mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra*,<sup>120</sup> are not referred to in the literature of mediaeval Northern India.

### Fire-arms

It is extremely doubtful whether fire-arms were ever used by the Hindus in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. While Prof. Dikshitar holds<sup>121</sup> that *ayaḥ*, *kaṇapa*, *tulā-guda*, *aurva*, *nālika*, *nārachs*, *agnivāna*, and *śataghñī* were all fire-arms, Prof. Jogesh Chandra Ray<sup>122</sup> and Dr. P. C. Chakravarti<sup>123</sup> contend that these were not real fire-arms. Medhātithi commenting on *Manu* VII. 90 observes : "while fighting his enemies in battle, he shall not strike with concealed weapons, nor with arrows that are poisoned or barbed on with flaming shafts."<sup>124</sup> This shows that the use of flaming shafts was known to the Hindus but it was denounced on moral grounds.

The real fire-arms, similar to guns and cannon, were *nālikas* and *śataghñas*. The working of big and small *nālikas* is described in the *Śukranītisāra*.<sup>125</sup> The author prescribes that one of the duties of the *sachiva* is to have an exact information of total stock of gunpowder in the arsenal.<sup>126</sup> Prof. Ray holds that Chāṇd Baradāyī used the word '*tupak*' in the sense of small guns.<sup>127</sup> With regard to *śataghñas*, Prof. Ray and Dr. Chakravarti, both quoting *Vaśiṣṭha-Dhanurveda*, take them to be cannon and distinguish them



from *śataghñis*.<sup>128</sup> Vasiṣṭha-Dhanurveda tells us that "the wise should place *śataghña* in forts for the security of the throne, and a large quantity of *rañjaka* (gun-powder) and *vaṭi* (bullets).

We cannot ascertain the exact date of composition of this work nor of the chapter on *nālikāstra* in the Śukranītisāra. Moreover, contemporary inscriptions of the North Indian Kings as well as the writings of Muslim historians are absolutely silent regarding the use of firearms by the Hindus in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In view of this silence it is not safe to assert that they were actually used by Indians in the period under survey.

### *Time for undertaking an expedition*

The nature of the military expeditions can be guessed from the time during which these are undertaken. Most of the writers on *Dharmaśāstra* and politics state that offensive military expeditions should be undertaken in Mārgaśīrṣa (November-December) or Phālguna and Chaitra<sup>129</sup> (March-May). Explaining the reasons for such timing, Medhātithi writes : "In Mārgaśīrṣa the autumn harvest would have been garnered, and the invader will be cheered by the prospect of having also his spring harvest. The time is good for siege operations. The rivers will then be running low, the ground hard, and there will be no overgrowth of jungle through which the army will have to march.....At any other season food grains, though sufficient, will not be diversified in kind and quality.....If, however, the invader is only anxious to inflict some injury on the enemy, the expedition is expected to be of short duration and if the invading forces are quite strong, the invasion may take place in Phālguna or Chaitra especially if the country which is to be attacked is rich in spring harvests. The invader can be sure then of adequate fodder supplies and will also be able to destroy the spring crops in the invaded country."<sup>130</sup> This shows that

economic causes, specially those relating to the supply of food and fodder determined largely the time for the military expeditions. The invading army hoped to be supported by the grains, which had recently been harvested in the enemy country. The soldiers must have taken away everything which fell on their way, thus inflicting famine on the people on whom their visitation occurred. The peasants had to look on helplessly while the looting away and destruction of all the crops they had grown with infinite pains went on under their nose. Had such expeditions been rare and infrequent they could somehow been tolerated. But as these constituted almost normal features of mediaeval life, the peasants must have lived in a state of chronic poverty.

Lakṣmīdhara quotes in his Rājadharmakāṇḍa, the views of Matsya Purāṇa regarding the suitability of different seasons for various categories of army. If it had a preponderance of infantry and elephants the rainy season is the best; an army which has got many chariots and horsemen, *hemanta* and *Sisir* (November to February) is the best. Summer is best suited for an expedition, which has got a preponderance of mules and cannons. An army which has got all the four constituents, spring and autumn are the best.<sup>131</sup> Śukranītisāra regards the months between September and December as the best, the spring as middling and summer as the worst season for an expedition.<sup>132</sup>

As soon as the king decided to lead an expedition, he called the astrologers to find out the most auspicious day. Someśvara, the author of Mānasollāsa, Bhoja, the author of Yuktikalpataru and Lakṣmīdhara, the Gāhaḍavāla minister, all hold that after consultation with astrologers and watching the prognostics, the king should start on his expedition. Someśvara further states that kings should not start on the fourth, eighth, ninth, twelfth or on the fourteenth day of bright or dark fortnight, nor on Monday and Saturday for marching towards east, nor on Friday and Sunday for journey to the west, nor on Thursday for going in the southern direction.<sup>133</sup> Thus out of

28 days of the lunar month as many as 10 were declared inauspicious. Besides these, five days in the week were considered bad for undertaking an expedition in one direction or the other. The favourable time for an expedition also depended on the interpretation of *śakunajñāna* or prognostics. The Matsya Purāṇa (241.2.12-14), which is quoted also by Lakṣmīdhara and Mānasollāsa,<sup>134</sup> acquaints us with a catalogue of good and bad omens for undertaking an expedition. Someśvara holds that one should not start on seeing persons riding camels or buffaloes, ascetics, mendicants, untouchables, persons without ears, or nose or hair, lean and thin persons, mentruous women, pregnant and mad women, the crippled, the blind and the deaf.

The influence of astrology on the timing of military expeditions can be gleaned from other literary works. Kalhaṇa tells us that when Uchchala was about to march against King Harṣa, he saw a man carrying a dead hare. Uchchala at once became confident of victory on seeing that good omen.<sup>135</sup> Further, from Rājapuri he marched towards the capital and was cheered up by prognostics. "Though he had only on the full-moon day of *Chaitra* been exposed to dangers, yet he started without fear on his expedition on the fifth day of the bright half of *Vaiśākha*,<sup>136</sup>" and as he was marching to Varāhamūla, "upon his head fell a garland from the head of (the image of) Mahāvarāha, just as if the earth, which rested on the shoulders of that (god) had bestowed it upon (him as the man of) her choice."<sup>137</sup> Ultimately Uchchala did indeed achieve success.

Not only the stars and omens, but also dreams dreamt by kings decided the time for undertaking an expedition. Lakṣmīdhara quotes the opinion of the Matsya Purāṇa on bad and good dreams.<sup>138</sup> Hemachandra tells us that Mūlarāja on being asked in a dream by Somanātha Mahādeva fought against Grāharipu.<sup>139</sup> Firishta preserved the traditional story that being told by the deity of Nagarkot in a dream, the Rājā of Delhi besieged Nagarkot.<sup>140</sup>

The importance of the astrologer in the royal court may be gauged from the repeated references to him in the Pāla, Sena and Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions. If the timing for beginning an expedition was dictated by dreams, omens and astrological forecasts, and not by diplomatic and strategic considerations, it afforded a golden opportunity to the Turko-Afghan invaders to gain easy victory. The King would not go out to check the onrush of an invading army if it fell on one of the ten forbidden days of the lunar month or one of the five inauspicious days in the week. Even when a battle was timed on a lucky day, the soldiers might be depressed by seeing something which was considered an evil omen. A nation cannot put forth effective resistance to determined invaders in such an atmosphere of superstition and fatalism. Belief in astrology was also not uncommon amongst the Mussalmans. But they never made a fetish of it.<sup>141</sup>

The *Yātrā* or march of the Indian army was at once colourful and spectacular. The King, as described in the *Mānasollāsa*, *Yuktikalpataru* and the *Agni Purāṇa*<sup>142</sup>, performed the *Nirājana* festival in the month of Āśvin (September-October) for victory in battle. And on the day of battle, according to the *Agni Purāṇa*, the King worshipped God Trivikrama, worshipped the weapons and beasts of burden with the *Nirājana Mantra* and heard the recital of hymns conveying the idea of all-round success. He would then walk thirty-two paces to the east, ride on elephant, chariot, horses and other animals respectively. Then the King should ride away without looking back and after going a distance of a krośa, take rest and worship gods and Brāhmaṇas. We have almost the same details in the *Mānasollāsa*. The King looked at his face on *ghee* and mirror in the early morning of the day of marching. Then bathing in the water of holy places, he was to worship Jagannātha, the family deity and the Brāhmaṇas. On seeing these auspicious things and amidst shouts of victory and good wishes, the King marched forth for the battle ground. If the Kings were so meticulous in the observance of the ceremonial

rules, he could not have taken prompt measures to forestall invaders<sup>143</sup>.

The Indian generals were accustomed to marshalling their soldiers in phalanxes, the formation of which became increasingly complex. In the age of Uśanas there were three divisions viz., wings (*pakṣau*), vanguard (*urasyama*) and rear-guard (*pratigraha*). In the age of Agni Purāṇa,<sup>144</sup> there were seven divisions. Mānasollāsa<sup>145</sup> mentions nine divisions, viz., *mukham*, *urasa*, *praurasyam*, *pratigraha*, *kakṣau*, *pra-kakṣau*, *pakṣau*, *prapakṣau* and *prsthā*. And the still later work Nītipra-prakāśikā (VI. 10) refers to thousands of *vyūhas*.

According to the exigencies of the situation, the Commander-in-chief arranged those divisions in different shapes<sup>146</sup>. Mānasollāsa<sup>147</sup> gives a vivid description of the arraying of soldiers in the battle-field. In the rear-centre and flanks should be stationed men with swords, in *prapakṣa* those armed with *kodaṇḍa*, in *pakṣa* (wings) those armed with *kheṭaka* weapons, in *prapakṣa* armoured men and cavalry, in vanguard (*purataḥ*) cavalry, infantry and in front elephants. But Chanḍeśvara quotes earlier authorities to show that on the flanks, the horses should be kept, then by the side of horses should be stationed chariots, then elephants and then the infantry<sup>148</sup>.

The Rājatarāṅgiṇi also mentions divisions in the battle-field. Uchchala proceeded towards Vijayakṣetra "moving along an army in its eighteenfold division."<sup>149</sup> Eighteen divisions are also mentioned elsewhere.<sup>150</sup> But Bhikṣācāra favoured only three arrays<sup>151</sup> of soldiers.

Stratagem is an essential feature of warfare. But the Indian writers on state-craft advised only the weak kings to take recourse to it. Even Kautīlya would not allow a strong king to take recourse to stratagem.<sup>152</sup> Kāmandaka, Agni Purāṇa and Śukranītisāra<sup>153</sup> devote some space to the description of *kūṭayuddha*, but Lakṣmīdhara, the Minister of War and Peace of the Gāhaḍavāla King Govindachandra, refuses even to mention it, as he would have nothing to do except *Dharma*

*Yuddha*. Chāṇḍeśvara quotes <sup>154</sup> with approval Manu's views that a king should not resort to concealed weapons in killing enemies in war, and also that the king should ask his soldiers not to shoot arrows that are poisoned or barbed, with flaming shafts, nor to strike "one who is standing on the ground, nor one who is a eunuch, nor the suppliant who has joined palms, nor one with loosened hair, nor one who is seated, nor one who says, 'I am yours', nor one who has fallen in difficulties regarding weapons; nor one in distress, nor one who is frightened, nor one who has turned his back." When the Turko-Afghans had absolutely no scruples about employing stratagem, it was foolhardy on the part of the Hindus to abjure it altogether in fighting against them. A typical illustration of their lack of wordly wisdom is to be found in the conduct of Pāithvīrāja III on the eve of the second battle of Tarain. Firishta relates that when Shihābuddīn of Ghūr reached Bhatinda, he was requested by Pāithvīrāja III to go back without a war so that there might not be unnecessary bloodshed. He also promised to allow a safe passage to the Turki army. Now, Shihābuddīn got a grand opportunity to take recourse to stratagem in taking the Hindu army unawares. The Chieftain of Ghūr replied: "it is very generous and friendly of you to make this offer of peace. I am sending a messenger to my brother, who is the reigning Sultān, urging him to agree to make peace with you on the condition of Bhatinda, the Punjab and Multan remaining with the House of Ghor and the rest of Hindusthan under the Rajas. Pending the arrival of his reply, I beg you to suspend hostilities." The Rajput army, in the words of Dr. Jadunath Sarkar "swallowed the bait, and believing the invader's pacific tone to be due to his fear of their valour and a sense of his own weakness in numbers, they made no preparation for action and even neglected the common alertness necessary in the face of an enemy. Shihāb-ud-dīn, on his part, lost no time.<sup>155</sup> Early next morning before day-break the Turko-Afghan army "covered the intervening miles (from Bhatinda to Tarain)

unmolested, and secured a lodgment in front of the Hindu camp before they could take alarm."

The slowness of the movement of the Rajput army was a sad contrast to such lightning speed of the Turko-Afghan invasions. When the Ghaznavīd ruler Maudūd was facing the rebellion of his brother Majdūd and put to great trouble by the incursions of the Saljuq Turks, the Rājā of Delhi recaptured Hansi, Thaneswar and Nagarkot in 435 A.H./1043 A.D. But the Hindu confederates failed to capture Lahore even after besieging it for seven months.<sup>156</sup> Had Lahore been captured, the history of India would have been written otherwise. Similarly, the army of Prithvirāja III wasted their valuable time in capturing Bhatinda immediately after the first battle of Tarain. In the words of Firishta, 'after the retreat of Mahomed Ghory, the allied Rajas continued their march to Bhatinda, which they besieged for one year and one month, and at last were obliged to grant favourable terms to the garrison.'<sup>157</sup> Had Prithvirāja quickly pursued the fast-moving Turko-Afghan cavaliers and been more vigorous in his siege of Bhatinda, he would have earned the fruits of victory of Tarain.

In this connection we may recount the other causes of the defeat of Prithvirāja III as mentioned in the traditional stories current in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. According to the Viruddhavidhi-viddhāṁsa of Lakṣmīdhara, Prithvirāja III was too much dependent upon two brothers, namely, Skanda, the Commander-in-Chief and Vāmana, the Sandhivigrahika.<sup>158</sup> While Prithvirāja was fighting at Tarain, Skanda was engaged in war elsewhere. Lakṣmīdhara, commenting on the absence of co-operation from Skanda, observes that "Prithvirāja, who though alive, was as good as dead and steeped in the vice of *nidrāvyasana*, was slaughtered in the battle by the Turuskas." But according to the Prabandhachintāmaṇi, Prithvirāja III was fast asleep due to the fast undertaken on the occasion of the *Ekādaśī*<sup>159</sup>. Further, due to the earlier differences with his minister (Pradhāna) Someśvara, the latter went over to the camp of Shihāb-ud-dīn and conducted the Ghūr Chieftain to

the Rajput camp.<sup>160</sup> The *Purātānaprabandhasamgraha*<sup>161</sup> states that Prithvirāja was asleep for ten days on the eve of the war. When most of his feudatories and soldiers were killed, he was roused from slumber by his sister. Prithvirāja III was charged with arrows and imprisoned by 'Sāhavadīna' (Shihāb-ud-dīn). The book also tells how Kaiñvāsa, the discharged minister, went over to the Turks and called in the sakas, i.e., the army of Shihāb-ud-dīn. Further the same story of treachery is told differently in the *Hammīra-Mahākāvya* by Nayachandra Sūri. The Jaina writer says that on the night before the day of the battle, Shihāb-ud-dīn was able to win over Prithvirāja's master of the horse and royal musicians, and a conspiracy was hatched. Next day, early in the morning, the Muhammedans attacked the Rajput camp. And then, "while he king's followers were thus preparing to meet their assailants, the disloyal master of the king's horse, as advised by his seducers, saddled and brought as the king's charger that day, a horse styled Nālyārambha and the musicians, who were waiting for the opportunity, when the king had mounted, began to play upon their instruments tunes that were the king's favourites. At this the rōyal steed began to dance profoundly. The king was diverted by this performance for a time, and forgot all the important business of the moment. The Muhammedans took advantage of the King's indolence and made a vigorous attack. The Rajputs, under the circumstances, could do little.<sup>162</sup>" Thus, according to the traditions current in later mediaeval period, the defeat of Prithvirāja III was due to the King's indolence and treachery in his own camp.

According to Dr. Jadunath Sarkar, the effect of the sudden attack of the Ghūri chieftain early in the morning was disastrous to the Hindus. "He (Shihābuddīn) seized the tactical initiative and forced the Hindus to fight on the ground and in the manner of the Turk's own choosing, instead of the defenders delivering any attack, planned and prepared from before." The Hindus fought the invaders, but with an empty stomach. Explaining the reason for the empty stomach, Dr.



Sarkar writes: "It was the Hindu practice to prepare for a pitched battle by waking at 3 o'clock in the morning, performing the morning wash and worship, eating the cooked food (*pakwān*) kept ready beforehand, putting on arms, and marching out to their appointed places in the line of battle at sunrise (See Mahadji Sindhia's preparations before setting out for the battle of Tunga or Lalsot, 1787). But in the second battle of Naraina, the Rajputs could take no breakfast; they had to snatch up their arms and form their lines as best as they could in a hurry." The Rajput soldiers in vain, tried to pursue the Turko-Afghan army from 9 O'clock in the morning to 3 O'clock in the afternoon," at the end of which the Hindus were utterly dissipated by the futility of their exertions and exhausted from hunger and thirst. Their rigid caste rules prevented them from being readily refreshed with food and drink in the battle-front.<sup>163</sup> At this crucial hour, Shihāb-ud-dīn asked his select corps of 12000 steel-clad warriors to strike the final blow on the Hindus. Soon Govindarāja, the leader of the van and ten thousand soldiers fell fighting on the ground and Prithvirāja III was imprisoned on the bank of the Sarasvatī by the Turkish soldiers.<sup>164</sup>

War was a passion with almost every mediaeval prince of India. It was undertaken not merely for setting right a real or imaginary wrong, but also for vindicating one's prowess. Frequent warfare dissipated the energy of the people, exhausted the treasury, inflicted incalculable hardship and sufferings on the peasants and artisans and contributed to a continuous process of disintegration within each kingdom. The princes of mediaeval India did not make any serious effort to give up fighting one another even in the face of dangers from the North-west.

They failed to build up any standing organisation for protecting their common country against the Turko-Afghan invasions. They failed to realise the true character of these onslaughts. They could hardly distinguish these from the usual predatory raids of a Hindu conqueror, bent upon making

as large a number of princes acknowledge his suzerainty as possible and satisfied with a mere promise of tribute in future. Many of them could not discern that the intention of these invaders was to uproot the ruling families completely and to settle down in Northern India as a conquering people.

In course of a comparatively long period of more than two hundred and sixteen years, from 978 to 1194 A.D. we come across only five instances of temporary military alliances between the princes of neighbouring states in Northern India. Firishta records the military assistance rendered by the Rajās of Delhi, Ajmer, Kalinjar and the Muslim heretic ruler of Multan to the Sāhi princes Jayapāla and Ānandapāla in 978, 1005 and 1008 A.D.<sup>165</sup> The Kashmirian king Saṅgrāma-rāja also rendered military help to the Shāhiya king Trilochana-pāla.<sup>166</sup> Prithvrāja III was joined by Chandrarāja, son of Govindarāja, the governor of Delhi and the feudatories of the Chāhamāna kings in the first battle of Tarain in 1190-91 A.D.<sup>167</sup> Excepting these five cases the majority of battles against the invaders were singly fought by the rulers of Northern India.

When the armies of Sultān Mahmūd were knocking at the gates of Kanauj, Mahipāla, the neighbouring rulers of Bengal and Bihar, did not evince any interest in checking the progress of the mighty invader or in coming to the rescue of the Gurjara-Pratihāra ruler, whose adversity was usually a matter of jubilation for the Pāla kings.

The *Maṇḍala* system of inter-state politics, preached in all the books of statecraft from Kautilya to Somadeva Sūri, taught a ruler to regard his immediate neighbours as natural enemies, in whose defeat and humiliation lay his own prosperity. A spirit of intense jealousy manifested itself amongst the Rajput princes even in the days of national calamity. They could not forget their petty quarrels and make a common cause to save Northern India from the terrible onslaughts of the Turko-Afghan invaders. The Rajput princes were actuated by petty clannish spirit.

**NOTES TO CHAPTER II (THE MILITARY SYSTEM  
AND ITS EFFECT)**

- 1 Kauṭilya IX. 2.
- 2 HDS VOL. III. p. 200.
- 3 Mānasollāsa Viṃśati II. 6. 566-69.
- 4 Kauṭilya XI. 1.
- 5 Habib's Introduction to HIED Vol. II p. 44.
- 6 Kauṭilya IX. 2.
- 7 Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal) II. 137-39.
- 8 Kāmandaka IV. 63, 65 and 67.
- 9 Agni Purāṇa ch. 220. 1.
- 10 Matsya Purāṇa Ch. 215. 10.
- 11 Śukranītisāra II. 429-30 (ed. Cal.)
- 12 Badal PI. EI. II. p. 106 and Gauḍalekhamālā pp. 130-31.
- 13 EI. IV. pp. 314. ff.
- 14 EI. I. 220.
- 15 RT. VIII. 472, 1071, 1071, 1073 and 1345.
- 16 DV. XVI.
- 17 RT. VII. 1319 ; VIII 473. 664.
- 18 Kauṭilya IX. 2.
- 19 Agni Purāṇa ch. 242. 1.
- 20 Kāmandakīya XVIII. 4.
- 21 Nītivākyāmṛta 22. 14-15.
- 22 Mānasollāsa Viṃśati II. 6. 557-60.
- 23 Gupta inscr. p. 165.
- 24 RC. II. 41-43.
- 25 DV. IX. 557. Prabandhachintāmaṇi Tr, Tawney p. 75 and Singhi Jain pp. 51-52.
- 26 Mānasollāsa Viṃśati II. 6. 559-60.
- 27 Rājanītiratnākara (ed. Jayaswal), p. 35.
- 28 *Ibid.* p. 35.
- 29 Mānasollāsa Viṃśati II. 6. 568-70.
- 30 Bhagalpur pl. of Nārāyaṇapāla, Bangaḍh pl. and Manahali cp. vide Gauḍalekhamālā p. 61 (line 36), p. 96 (line 40) and p. 153 (line 37) respectively.
- 31 RT. VII. 979, 1302 and VIII 2007 for Khaśas ; VII 1149, 1501 and 1868.
- 32 *Ibid.* VIII 2264.
- 33 *Ibid.* VII 1149.
- 34 Manu VII. 193.
- 35 Rājanītiratnākara p. 36.
- 36 RT. VIII 1328.

- 37 *Ibid.* VII 48 and VIII 323, 1082, 1133, 1394, 1841 and 3124.
- 38 *Ibid.* VIII 1325, 1327.
- 39 Abh. pt. III. 306.
- 40 Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture by K. K. Handiqui p. 60.
- 41 Yaśastilakachampū (ed. N.S.Press), III pp. 464-67.
- 42 Agni Purāṇa Ch. 228. 7.
- 43 Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal.) IV. 7. 21.
- 44 Yuktikalpataru (ed. Cal.) p. 7.
- 45 Mbh. Ādiparva II. 19; ed. Sukthanker 1.2.15.
- 46 Vaijayanti Bhūmikāṇḍa, Ch. on Kṣatriya, verses 57-58.
- 47 Nītiprakāśikā VII 3-10.
- 48 Nītivākyāmṛta pp. 83-84.
- 49 Mānasollāsa Viṃśati II 574.
- 50 Mbh. Sabhā 53. 5; Sāptika 13.2; Udyoga 86.6.
- 51 Uttarādhyaṇa sūtra (SBE. II. 47).
- 52 Sumangalavilāsini I. 124.
- 53 Harṣacharita II. 70.
- 54 Yuktikalpataru p. 182. verses 26-28.
- 55 Mānasollāsa Viṃśati. II Ch. VI. 5/3.
- 56 ŚP. p. 258 Verses 1676-77.
- 57 *Ibid.* p. 256, verse No. 1675.
- 58 B. P. Sinha: PIHC. 1955 pp. 51-57 (Elephants in Anc. Indian army).
- 59 Megasthenes, Fragment I, p. 39.
- 60 Kauṭilya X. 4-5, Agni Purāṇa Ch. 242. 23-24. Kāmandaka XX 1-3. Nītivākyāmṛta p. 207, Yaśastilakachampū II. 176, 180, Mānasollāsa II. Ch. VI 622, Sadukti p. 203, ŚP Verse nos. 1570, 1572, and 1576.
- 61 ŚP. Verse 1560.
- 62 *Ibid.* verse 1563.
- 63 Yaśastilaka III p. 491.
- 64 RT. VII 1553-55.
- 65 RC. II. 20, pp. 53-54.
- 66 Śukranītisāra IV. 7. 19 and 20 (ed. Cal.)
- 67 Briggs. 1.47.
- 68 HIED II 223.
- 69 PIHC. 1955, p. 57.
- 70 AR. p. 248; Dikshitar: War in Ancient India p. 166, Chakravarti: Art of war in Ancient India p. 26.
- 71 Yuktikalpataru p. 7 verse 45, Rāj. p. 95: Rājanītiratnākara Text p. 40, Śukranītisāra IV. 7. 20 and 23 (ed. Cal.)
- 72 RC. III 44.
- 73 SS. (Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra Ch. 31).

- 74 *Ibid.* 31. 53 (GOS Vol. I. p. 173).  
 75 *Ibid.* 31. 59.  
 76 *Ibid.* 31. 95-99.  
 77 *Ibid.* 31. 95.  
 78 *Ibid.* 31. 96.  
 79 Dikshitar : War in Ancient India : p. 277.  
 80 SS. 31. 79-80.  
 81 RV. I. 116. 5, X. 101. 2; VŚ XXI. 27, SB IV. 2. 5.10. Mbh. Śānti 59. 41 Manu VII 192, Kāmandaka XVI. 50, Rapson : Catalogue of India coins, Intro. p. 31-2; Deobaranark inscr. (CH III 217), Aphsad inscr. (IA. XIX. p. 198). Khalimpur Cp. (EI. I, 299 ff, XIV. 326 ff), Sachau I. 208 etc.)  
 82 Yuktikalpataru (ed. Cal.) p. 224, verse 84 ; p. 225 verses 96-98, p. 226, verse 6.  
 83 *Ibid.* p. 229, verses 30-31.  
 84 HIED II p. 478 (Aligarh ed. p. 484).  
 85 Sachau, Vol. I p. 208.  
 86 Vide op. cit. f.n. no. 41.  
 87 EI. XII. 40  
 88 iB. III. 48.  
 89 RT. VIII 1497-1502.  
 90 Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal. p. 512-513) Ch. IV. 7. 22-24.  
 91. HIED I.5 and 14.  
 92 IHQ. XXVI (1950) p. 226.  
 93 Nītiprakāśikā VII 6-11, 27-30.  
 94 Purāṇanaprabandhasaṃgraha, ed. Singhi Jain Series, p. 87.  
 95 Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal) I. 315 and 317, IV. 7. 25-27.  
 96 Manu VII 96-7.  
 97 Jha, G. N.: Manu Smṛiti with the Bhāṣya of Medhātithi Vol. III. Pt. II pp. 344-45.  
 98 Gautama I 20-23.  
 99 Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal.) IV. 7. 372.  
 100 RV. II. 24. 8, VIII. 7. 4; IX. 99; X. 18.9; 125.6; Av. IV. 6. 4, Samyukta Nikāya pts. II 267-68, EI I. 87, 132, 302, 312 etc.; Agni Purāṇa Ch. 245. 4, Chakravarti : Art of War pp. 151-56.  
 101 Mbh., Karna, 24, 21, Drona 125, 29; Kauṭilya II. 18. Raghuvamśā III. 56, ŚP. verse nos. 1777-78 and 1787 quoting Śivadhanurveda, Mānasollāsa Vol. I, Ch. II, 1216, SS Vol. I. p. 178, Ch. 31, 103; Cf. also Kauṭilya XIII. 4, Manu VII 90, Mānasollāsa II. 1065 and 1213, RT. VII 982-83.  
 102 Kauṭilya II. 18, RC. II. 50, R1 VII 792, 1505, Yuktikalpataru. pp. 141-42 verses 47-50.

- 103 Kauṭilya *ibid*; SS. 31. 107, Śukranītisāra IV. 7. 215 ; Nītiprakāśikā V. 22 ff.
- 104 Mbh. Karṇa 27. 4 ; Kauṭilya *ibid* ; Agni Purāṇa 152.10
- 105 Mbh. Ādi 19.12, Udyoga 19. 3; 154. 9. 13, Vana 20. 33 etc. Kauṭilya *ibid* ; Śukranītisāra *ibid* ; Vaij. p. 117 line 330.
- 160 Mbh. Udyoga 19.3, 154.6 ; Bhīṣma 96.58, 106.23, Drona 24.59 etc ; Matsya Purāṇa 160.10 ; Kauṭilya *ibid* ; Vaij p. 117 line 331 ; Agni Purāṇa 252.15, Art of War p. 167, War in Ancient India p. 106.
- 107 Mbh. Bhīṣma 51.28 ; Udyoga 51.8. Drona 15.4, 15.13, Śalya 57. 18 ; Kauṭilya *ibid* ; Agni Purāṇa 252. 11-12 ; Śukranītisāra IV. 7. 212.
- 108 Kauṭilya *ibid* ; Agni Purāṇa 252.13, Yuktikalpataru p. 140 ; Nītiprakāśikā V. 9.10.
- 109 Agni Purāṇa 251.2, 252. 6-8. Śukranītisāra IV. 7. 216 ; Nītiprakāśikā IV. 45-46.
- 110 Kauṭilya, *ibid* ; Yuktikalpataru p. 140 ; Śukranītisāra *ibid*.
- 111 Kauṭilya, *ibid* ; Agni Purāṇa 252.9; Yuktikalpataru p. 140 verse 29, Śukranītisāra IV. 7. 215.
- 112 Kauṭilya, *ibid* ; Yuktikalpataru, *ibid*.
- 113 Mbh. Sābhā 5.36, Śānti 69.45, Rāmāyaṇa, Sundara 62.64, Laṅkā 3. 12ff ; Kauṭilya, *ibid*.
- 114 Agni Purāṇa 241. 28 ; 249.4 ; 252.18 ; RT. VIII 1677, SS Ch. 31.
- 115 SS. Vol. I. p. 174. Verse 57.
- 116 Agni Purāṇa 245. 21-22.
- 117 SP verses 4677-78.
- 118 Yuktikalpataru. p. 170 verses 25-28.
- 119 Dikshitar: War in Ancient India pp. 119-120.
- 120 Kauṭilya II. 18.
- 121 Dikshitar ; *op.cit.* pp. 102-105.
- 122 Ray, Jogesh Chandra : Ancient Indian Life pp. 160-61.
- 123 Chakravarti, P.C. : *op. cit.* pp. 173-74.
- 124 Jha, *op. cit.* Vol. II. 2. p. 340.
- 125 Sukanītisāra (ed. Cal.) I. 239 and 255, IV. 7. 192-208 Cf. translation of the passages in Ray, *op. cit.* p. 162.
- 126 Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal.) II. 93.
- 127 Ray, *op. cit.* pp. 165-66.
- 128 Dikshitar, *op. cit.* p. 105 ; Ray, *op. cit.* p. 160.
- 129 Mbh. Śānti 100. 10 ; Manu VII 182-83, Viṣṇu 3. 40 ; Vīramitrodaya-Rājanīti p. 331 quoting Viṣṇudharmottara ; Rāy. p.

115, 123-4; *Mānasollāsa* (GOS. No. XXVIII p. 96) *Viṃśati* II. 345, *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal) IV. 7. 224, RT. VII 47 and VIII 2886.

130 Jha, Ganganath's translation; *Manu-smṛiti* Vol. III Pt. II pp. 390-91.

131 Rāy Ch. on *Yātrā*.

132 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.) IV. 7. 224-25

133 *Mānasollāsa* (Vol. I) *Viṃśati* II. 761-64, 796-97; *Yuktikalpataru*, p. 176-177 verses 78-87 Cf. *Agni Purāṇa*, ch. 233 1-10.

134 Rāj. p. 116, *Mānasollāsa* *Viṃśati* II. 811-919. Cf. *Agni Purāṇa* Ch. 230, 8-12 for good omens like a cow, horse, jar full of water, fire, weapon, conch etc.

135 RT. VII 1291.

136 *Ibid.* VII 1297.

137 *Ibid.* VII 1310.

138 Ray, p. 118-22. Good dreams were: sprouting of grass and trees in navel, shooting up of fruit-bearing trees on body, wearing of garlands of dry flowers, embracing or raising enemy's flag, swallowing earth and sea, killing enemies, eating uncooked flesh or fish, bathing in blood, drinking liquor, blood, wine or boiled milk, sight of clear sky, cows being milked, coronation etc. Bad dreams were: sprouting of trees and grass on parts of body other than navel, smearing brass-powder on head, nakedness, shaved crown of head, wearing shabby clothes, fall from a height, riding on boar, bear, ass, camels etc., eating birds, fish, oil; dance, laughter, songs and marriage; bath in muddy water or in cowdung, ascending on funeral pyre, descent of conch, flag, sun and moon, embracing unmarried girls, practising homosexuality, loss of one's limbs, march to the south, playing with demons, monkeys and bear etc. Cf. identical passages in *Agni Purāṇa* Ch. 229. 2-16. The arrangements of verses are dissimilar in many places, e.g. Mat. P. Ch. 242 verse 10=Ag. P. verse 7 and 10; M.P. verse 11=Ag. P. 10+11; M.P. 14=Ag. P. 13 and 14, M.P. 23=Ag. P. 21-22, M.P. 32-33=Ag. P. 30-31.

139 IA. IV. pp. 72-74.

140 Briggs I. p. 118.

141 Timur's reference to astrologers: "And with the assistance of astrologers, I ascertained the benign or malignant aspects of the stars; their motions and the revolutions of the heavens." (*Institutes of Timour* ed. Davy and White, p. 213). But the astrologers never got the upperhand. When Timour decided upon the siege of Delhi on 30th December, 1398 A.D. soothsayers and astrologers secretly held disputations concerning the disposition of stars and

planets on the occasion. But Timour said plainly, "what avail the triplicity or conjunctions of the planets? I'll never delay one moment the execution of my projects." (Hist of Timur Bec. Vol. II. p. 55). And on the 1st January, 1399 A.D./5th Rabi-ul-akhir 801 A.H. Timur crossed the river Jamuna for marching to Delhi.

142 Mānasollāsa Viṃśati II. 1152-62 (GOS. Vol. 28. p. 132-33) Yuktikalpataru p. 178 verses 88-94 and p. 179-81 verses 1-22: Agni Purāṇa, Ch. 236, 16-23. Cf. Kāmandaka XIX. 2.

143 Kauṭilya X. 6.

144 Agni Purāṇa, Ch. 241, 41-42.

145 Mānasollāsa (Vol. I, p. 135) Viṃśati II verses 1178-81.

146 Mbh. Udyoga 19. 34-35. Bhīṣma 50. 40, 51. 1ff, 69. 7-12, 81. 12, 81. 23, 87. 5, 99. 1, 99. 14, Droṇa 85. 23, Karṇa 46. 11ff, 46. 28, 11. 24, 11. 28, Śalya 8. 24 etc.; Kauṭilya X. 6 mentions 17 types of daṇḍavyūha, but Agni Purāṇa, while mentioning 17 types of daṇḍavyūha, uses, the names like *sthūṇakarna* in stead of Kauṭilya's *sthulakarna*, *surpāsya* instead of *jhasāhya*, and does not enumerate Kauṭilya's *durjaya*; Kauṭilya X. 6 on *bhogavyūha* but in Agni Purāṇa 242. 60 only five varieties and in 242. 56-57 as many as 7 varieties. In the last, however, new names like *ahisañchāri*, *pariplabangaka*, *daṇḍapaksa* and *vugorasya* are not found in Kauṭilya. For two varieties of *mandalavyūha* see Kauṭilya 6 and Agni Purāṇa 242. 57-58; for *asannatavyūha* see Kauṭilya, ibid and Agni Purāṇa 242. 58-59 with slightly varied names.

147 Mānasollāsa Viṃśati II. 1184-89.

148 Rājanītiratnākara, Text p. 40. Commenting on the battle-order (*vyūhas*), Dr. P. C. Chakravarti writes "Whereas the Hindu love of *vyūhas* committed the armies of India to a cult of positions and defensive tactics, they regarded it as fundamental proposition of warfare that offence was better than defence, that the sword was better than the shield". (Art of War in Anc. India, p. 195) But discussing the need of formation of *vyūhas* Mānasollāsa observes that the good phalanx should be so arranged that it may break through the enemy's phalanx (Mānasollāsa II. 1178 and 1190)

149 RT. VII. 1371. Stein observes that the number was a traditional one.

150 *Ibid.* VII 1513.

151 *Ibid.* VIII 1197.

152 Kauṭilya X. 3.

153 Kāmandaka XIX. 54-66, Agni Purāṇa 240. 16, Śukranīti-sāra (ed. Cal.) IV. 7. 350, 368-69.



- 154 Rājanītiratnākara, Text p. 40. quoting Manu VII 89-93.
- 155 Hindusthan Standard, March 14, 1954, page 1 of Magazine Section.
- 156 Briggs I. 118-20.
- 157 *Ibid.* I p. 173.
- 158 IC, VIII (1941-1942) p. 328 Cf. Struggle for Empire p. 112.
- 159 IC. X. 69. The Cat. of Mss. in the Library of India Office, No. 1577 reads "Gatenyasamgare skande nidrāvyasanannadhiḥ vyāpāditaḥ Turuṣkaissa Jivanmṛto Yuddhi."
- 160 Prabandhachintāmaṇi, ed. Singhi Jain Series, p. 144.
- 161 Pūrātanaprabandhāsaṅgraha, ed. Singhi Jain Series p. 87.
- 162 IA. VIII (1879) p. 61.
- 163 Hindusthan Standard, 14th March, 1954.
- 164 Struggle for Empire, p. 112.
- 165 'Uthī in HIND II. p. 31. Struggle for Empire pp. 3, 4, 8 and 9.
- 166 RT. VII 47-69.
- 167 Struggle for Empire pp. 109-110.

### CHAPTER III

#### CASTES AND PROFESSIONS

The traditional theory relating to the professions to be followed by the four *varṇas* was not scrupulously adhered to in the period under review. The tendency to deviate from the customary profession was noticeable even in an earlier age. The Brāhmaṇas, for example, did not invariably confine their activity to studying, teaching, worshipping and the performance of other priestly functions. Atri (verses 373-383) speaks of Kṣātra Brāhmaṇa, who lives by fighting, the Vaiśya Brāhmaṇa, who lives by engaging himself in agriculture, cattle-rearing and trade, the Śūdra-Brāhmaṇa, who sells lac, salt, milk, ghee, honey, meat and some particular dyes, and Niṣāda-Brāhmaṇa, who adopts the profession of thief and robber. Pressure of economic circumstances compelled many Brāhmaṇa families to encroach upon the preserves of the three other *varṇas*. Those who accepted service under princes and feudatory chiefs either in civil or in military departments, did not lose their social status and privileges. But the humbler members of the Brāhmaṇa community, even when they followed priestly avocation, were regarded as degraded ones. For example, Vijñāneśvara and Aparārka state that if one touches a Brāhmaṇa, who lives on the things offered to the image of a deity continuously for three years or by officiating as the priest for the whole village, has to purify himself by taking a bath with his clothes on. Thus the circle of the Brāhmaṇa community following strictly the rules of conduct as laid down in the Dharmaśāstras gradually narrowed down. The digests of our period enunciated the principles of social etiquette from the standpoint of the microscopic minority of the Hindu community, as they were mainly the repository of the learning, in Śruti and Smṛiti. They meticulously observed the rules of ceremonial purity.

The "ancient Hindus", observes Kane, "had a horror of uncleanliness and they desired to segregate those who followed unclean professions like those of sweepers, workers in hides, tanners, guardians of cemeteries etc. This segregation cannot be said to have been quite unjustifiable"<sup>2</sup>. The difficulty, however, in segregating persons following the professions, which were regarded as unclean, was, that, in course of time, a very large number of workers, engaged in performing the most essential services for the society, came to be viewed as unclean. Aparārka quotes<sup>3</sup> the *Brahma Purāṇa* to show that the food which comes from the hands or which is owned by the members of the following professions is forbidden: a singer, an actor, a physician, a surgeon, a goldsmith, a blacksmith, a vendor of weapons, a tailor, a washerman, a distiller or seller of liquors, an oil-presser, a bard, a carpenter, one who makes his living by astrology, one whose duty is to ring bells, a village officer, worker in hides, a potter, a wrestler, a worker in bamboo, an indigenous banker, and one who serves as a priest to the whole village. It is not possible for a modern man to find out any rational cause for treating a bard or singer as an unclean person. It is still more difficult to explain how a nation could effectively defend itself against foreign invasions when it tried to segregate all those, who were engaged in manufacturing and selling arms, armours or chariots. Medhātithi in explaining *Manu VIII. 65* betrays a feeling of contempt for all craftsmen who are labelled as persons of "mean nature", who are prone to straying from the path of honesty. The idea of branding the physicians and surgeons as social outcasts appears to be equally fantastic. *Vijñāneśvara*, in explaining *Yājñavalkya I.120*, quotes *Devala* to show that it is the duty of a *Śūdra* to engage himself in agriculture, rearing of cattle, selling of commodities and also in drawing, painting, dancing, singing, and playing on musical instruments like the flute, lute, drums and tabors. Thus the sacerdotal class in the period under review came to regard not only the fine arts but also the professions.

which had been held peculiar to the Vaiśyas in olden times as fit for persons of the lowest strata.

Alberuni mentions the four traditional castes.<sup>4</sup> Outside these were the *antyajas* and some people called Hādi, Doma, Chaṇḍāla and Badhatau, who could be distinguished from one another by their occupation. Alberuni must have been stating here merely what he had read in ancient scriptures and not what actually obtained in Hindu society in his time.

At the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. numerous castes existed and even before the beginning of the Christian era, there was a large number of castes and sub-castes. Kalhaṇa and later on Kullūkabhaṭṭa mention as many as sixty four castes.<sup>5</sup> Numerous were the mixed castes. The Brihaddharma Purāṇa<sup>6</sup> mentions 41 mixed castes, having the status of Śūdras. The Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa states that it is useless and impossible to count the number of those who belong to the mixed castes.<sup>7</sup> The names as well as the number of these castes have varied according to time and localities. Yet the authors of *dharmaśāstras* and *smṛitis* attempted to fit in these numerous castes within the framework of the traditional four *varṇas*. The process began with Manu-Yājñavalkya and it continued ceaselessly till the days of Raghunandana and Mitra Miśra in the seventeenth century A. D.

### *Brāhmaṇas :*

The Brāhmaṇas stood at the top of the social hierarchy. They had regained their power and were responsible for reinterpreting the regulatory canons of life as laid down by the earlier texts. The digests of the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. contributed to the conservation of the social pattern. These digests and law-books give us the impression that the Brāhmaṇas were the really qualified leaders of society and thought. Lakṣmīdhara in his *Dānakāṇḍa*<sup>8</sup> states that the ideal Brāhmaṇa donee should be devoted to the Vedic studies, chaste, truthful, serene, afraid of sin, practise *ahimsā*, keep burning the sacred Fires, scrupulously observe the

religious vows, love the cows and, be free from greed. Elsewhere in the Grihasthakaṇḍa, the abovementioned writer gives an ideal picture of the duties of the Sālina and Yāyāvara Brāhmaṇas.<sup>9</sup> Such noble and large-hearted Brāhmaṇas could be found in the early mediaeval period. The qualification of the donees of the time of King Mahāśivagupta of the Somavāṃśī dynasty was that they should be acquainted with the six supplements of the Vedas, tend the fire, should not accept service under anybody, and shun gambling and prostitutes.<sup>10</sup>

Contemporary literature and inscriptions show that the Brāhmaṇas had numerous sub-sections. During our period, the Brāhmaṇas were divided in sub-sections according to their localities. In Bengal the nomenclature of the Brāhmaṇs according to the *gāṃis*, began in the period between the fifth and seventh centuries A.D. It became an accepted convention by the twelfth century. Leaving aside the *Kulaḷis*, whose authenticity is doubtful, contemporary literature acquaints us with the names of *gāṃis*. Bhaṭṭa Bhava-deva's mother was the daughter of a Vandyaghaṭīya Brāhmaṇa. Another Vandyaghaṭīya Brāhmaṇa was Sarvānanda. Bhava-deva and Śāntiyāgarika Rāmadevaśarman belonged to Siddhala village. Aniruddha, the guru of Vallālasena, was a Champāhaṭīya Mahāmahopādhyāya, and Vaṭeśvara, the recipient of the Manahali grant of Madanapāla also belonged to Champāhiti. The names of other *gāṃis* are referred to in Daśarathadeva's Adavadi plate and also to be found in the Saduktikarṇāmr̥its.<sup>11</sup>

Halāyudha refers to the division of the Rāḍhiya and Vārendra Brāhmaṇas, in his Brāhmaṇasarvasva. Besides them, there were Vaidika Brāhmaṇas. The *Kulaḷis*, possibly preserving the tradition, observe that a section of them were descendants of the five Brāhmaṇas brought from Kanaub by

\* HB I. p. 635-637 for a list of Gāmis of the Rāḍhiya and Vārendra Brāhmaṇas.

the Varman King Sāmalavarman is Śaka 1001 A.D. and another section came from the banks of the Sarasvatī river and settled in Koṭālipādā under the patronage of King Harivarman. Amongst the Vaidika Brāhmaṇas, who came from Upper India, were known as Pāschātyas and those from Drāviḍa and Utkala as Dākṣiṇātyas. Other classes of Brāhmaṇas, who are known to *Kulaṇṭis* alone, were Vyāsa, Parāśara, Kauṇḍīnya and Saptasatī.<sup>12</sup> In Bihar, we find mention of three classes of Brāhmaṇas. The Maithila Brāhmaṇas formed a category by themselves. Some of them migrated to Assam.<sup>13</sup> In the Gaya region settled the Maga or Śākadvīpī Brāhmaṇas and the Gayawals. The Govindapur inscription dated 1137 A.D. tells us that the Maga Brāhmaṇas were brought from Śākadvīpa by Śāmba.<sup>14</sup> A branch of these Maga Brāhmaṇas settled in Magadha. Manoratha and Daśaratha served King Varṇamāna of Magadha. They served the King in the capacity of Pratīhāra and superintendent of *mahallaka*, which word has been translated by Kielhorn as eunuchs (verse 11). This inscription also suggests that there was a branch of these Śākadvīpī Brāhmaṇas in Gauḍa. Gaṅgādharma married Pāsala-devī, a daughter of Jayapāṇi, a Gauḍa official (verse 29). The existence of the Gayāwāl Brāhmaṇas is proved not only by tradition but also by the Saktipur copper-plate of Lakṣmaṇasena, dated 1183 A.D.,<sup>15</sup> which records that the donor's father Vallālasena had granted a plot of land to Haridāsa, a Gayāwāl Brāhmaṇa. In the Uttar Pradesh too, we notice different sections of Brāhmaṇas, during the period under survey. We have already referred to the Kanauj Brāhmaṇas, who are also mentioned in Bengal *Kulaṇṭis*. Moreover, the Pali grant dated VS 1189/1133 A.D. acquaints us with the Sarayūpārī Brāhmaṇas. Thakkura Jayapālaśarma was the donee of ten *tālukas* of land from Rālhanadevī, the mother of King Govindachandra.<sup>16</sup> Kalhaṇa himself refers to the non-Kashmiri Brāhmaṇas in the reign of King Jayasinha in Kashmir. A number of Brāhmaṇas from the Indus region

and numerous Drāviḍas took up their residence in the Siṁhapur *matha* built by the abovementioned King.<sup>17</sup> Contemporary inscriptions acquaint us with two classes of Brāhmaṇas in Rajputana. A Maga or Sakadvīpa Brāhmaṇa is mentioned as composer of the Ghatiyala inscription of Kakkuka,<sup>18</sup> as early as the ninth century A.D. in Jodhpur. The Aboḷis, who are mentioned only in inscriptions of Rajputana, were usually temple servants.<sup>19</sup> These inscriptions relate that they originally belonged to Dvaravati. In Gujarat we find several classes of Brāhmaṇas, namely, Moḍha,<sup>20</sup> Udīchya.<sup>21</sup> Sihora,<sup>22</sup> Rāyakvāl,<sup>23</sup> Nāgara,<sup>24</sup> Prāgvāt, Gugli, Uesval, Tapodhana,<sup>25</sup> Prasanna-Purasthāna and Kapilāvarta.<sup>26</sup> Prof. K. B. Vyas and Sankalia hold that these Brāhmaṇas derived their caste names from territories, like Ānandapurānagara, Khetaka Mottaka, Moḍheraka etc. They are also of opinion that some of these Brāhmaṇas, called Śrīmālā, Mevād, Udīchyas, migrated from Northern India, especially from Rajputana and Malwa, sometime between 1000 and 1300 A.D. Some sections like Udīchyas went by royal invitation to officiate as priests and teachers, while others took their shelter in Gujarat to save themselves from the Turko-Afghan invasions.<sup>27</sup> The Bombay Gazetteer records traditions about Śrīmālā or Bhinnmal Brāhmaṇas. According to one of these traditions, the Śrīmālā Brāhmaṇas, were those Gurjara Brāhmaṇas, who received the city of Śrīmālā from King Jagatsen, as a donation. According to another account, they were of Kashmiri origin and belonged to the Jamāwāla caste. They were brought to South Marwar by King Jag Som and they agreed to migrate for fear of the Arab invader Bughra in VS 759/703 A.D.<sup>28</sup> The same work incorporates interesting legend about Oswals." They are strange highnosed hatchet-faced men with long lank hair and long beards and whiskers. They were originally Magha Brāhmaṇas and still are Vaishnavas, worshipping the Sun. They know that their story is told in the Namagranth of the Surya Purāṇa."<sup>29</sup>

It is necessary to refer here to the origin of the Guhilots

and the Brahma-Kṣatriyas. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar holds that the Guhilots were originally Nāgara Brāhmaṇas.<sup>29</sup> But G. H. Ojha, C. V. Vaidya and M. L. Mathur have convincingly adduced proofs to show that they were Kṣatriyas.<sup>31</sup> With regard to the term Brahma-Kṣatra, Dr. Bhandarkar was inclined to believe that it was a caste in the process of evolution. We find that the Guhilot King Bhartribhaṭṭa, Sāmantasena of Bengal and the Paramāra King Muñja, were called Brāhmaṇa Kṣatras.<sup>32</sup> The nomenclature was given to "those who were Brāhmaṇas first and became Kṣatriyas afterwards" i.e. "those who exchanged their priestly for martial pursuits<sup>33</sup>." In the context of the fact that numerous mediaeval Indian inscriptions refer to the Brāhmaṇas following the profession of a soldier, it is not unlikely that the Senas, Paramāras and the Guhilots were originally Brāhmaṇas and later on avowed the profession of a Kṣatriya.

The earlier *dharmaśāstras* and the *nibandhas* of our period, however, classify the Brāhmaṇas according to their avocations. We have already referred to the classification by Atri. Devala classifies the Brāhmaṇas according to the standard of knowledge of the Vedas, viz., *mātra* (who has not studied any of the Vedas nor performs the functions of a Brāhmaṇa but is simply born in a Brāhmaṇa family), *brāhmaṇa* (who has studied a portion of the Veda), *śrotriya* (studied only one recension of the Veda along with its six *aṅgas* and performed six duties of Brāhmaṇas), *anuchāna* (knowing the meaning of the Vedas and Vedāṅgas, pure of heart and tending sacred fires), *bhrūṇa* (having qualities of anuchāna brāhmaṇa and performing yajñas), *ṛṣkalpa* (one who has worldly and Vedic knowledge), *ṛṣi* (a celibate, leading an austere life, truthful and is able to curse or reward) and *muni* (who is given to staying in a forest, subsists on roots, fruits, vegetables<sup>34</sup>). This passage of Devala regarding the eight grades of Brāhmaṇas have been quoted by Lakṣmīdhara<sup>35</sup>, Vallālasena<sup>36</sup> and Chaṇḍeśvara<sup>37</sup>.



Contemporary literature and inscriptions show that some of the Brāhmaṇas of the period under survey led simple lives and followed the ideal of plain living and high thinking. It was because of the maintenance of the high standard of conduct that Lakṣmīdhara eulogised the Brāhmaṇa by quoting Yama that "to be born a Brāhmaṇa is deemed a piece of rare fortune, the result of good deeds in a past life"<sup>38</sup>. But society is composed not only of such persons, but also of some despicable and vile men. Three such instances of bad Brāhmaṇas can be given from the Rājatarāṅgiṇī. King Śaṁgrāmarāja appointed Pārtha as the City Prefect (Nagarādhi-kṛita). He had illicit relations with his brother's wife. Moreover, unlike a Brāhmaṇa, and "entirely devoid of merit" he committed slaughter and other sins on the holy platform of the Śaiva temple of Pravareśa<sup>39</sup>. Amongst the companions of the licentious King Kalaśa (1063-89 A. D.) were two Brāhmaṇas, named Pramadakaṇṭha and Loṣṭaka. The former lived in incest with his own daughter. Despite this evil conduct he was not at all afraid of the society. It was natural for such a man to induce the King to ignore the distinction between those with whom sexual relation is permissible and those with whom it was not allowable<sup>40</sup>. Loṣṭaka became dear to the King as "*Guru*, procurer and astrologer"<sup>41</sup>. The Kathāsaritsāgara tells us of Brāhmaṇas, who made use of a candle prepared from human fat<sup>42</sup>, worked as robbers and unhesitatingly killed cows<sup>44</sup>.

### *Profession :*

The Brāhmaṇas maintained their livelihood by following varied types of profession. Some of these professions were allowed by the *dharmaśāstras*. It has already been shown that the normal business of the Brāhmaṇas was to teach the Vedas and allied subjects and to act as the *purohita* of the King. Lakṣmīdhara devotes a chapter on the specific ceremonies to be performed by the *purohita* in order to avoid calamities in a kingdom. Besides the daily worship of the

household divinities, the royal priests offered sacrificed animals to the goblins and *piśāchas*. It was the duty of the King to arrange for the performance of two lacs *homas* a year, one crore *homa* during a reign, expiatory ceremonies at eclipses, a *mahāśānti* on the occasion of an earthquake and the worship of Kārtikeya and Devī in order to ward off fear and overcome enemies<sup>15</sup>. Inscriptions also refer to numerous grants to the *purohitas*. The Gāhaḍavāla kings gave donations to such *purohitas* like Jāguśarman<sup>16</sup> and Devavara<sup>17</sup>. The Barrackpur copper-plate records the grant of four *pāṭakas* of land to Udayakaradevaśarman as fee for conducting the *homa* in the *Tulāpuruṣadāna*,<sup>18</sup> by Vilāsadevī, the queen of Vijayasena. Similar donations are referred to in the Naihati, Tarpandighi and Madhainagar copper-plates. The Gujarati *purohitas* were also recipients of donations.<sup>19</sup>

The ancient law-givers like Gautama (VII. 6 and 25) Manu (VIII. 348-349) allowed the Brāhmaṇas to take up arms in times of distress and also to protect themselves, for saving cows and Brāhmaṇas or preventing admixture of *Varṇas*.<sup>50</sup> A note of dissent is expressed in Āpastamba.<sup>51</sup> The general practice is also referred to in the Sukranītisāra.<sup>52</sup> As in the past, so during the period under review, the Brāhmaṇas engaged themselves as soldiers. In Bengal, Govardhana, the father of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, was not only a distinguished scholar but also a warrior<sup>53</sup>... "having increased (both his) land and learning in battlefields and assemblies of heretics, (respectively) by the feat of his arms and (display) of oratorical skill he justified his name (Govardhana) in a two-fold sense."<sup>54</sup> The Rājatarāṅgiṇī also records the skill of Brāhmaṇas as soldiers in the battlefield.<sup>55</sup> Inscriptions of the Chandella, Kalachuri and Chaulukya dynasties also refer to Brāhmaṇas as military officers.<sup>56</sup> The brilliant services of the Brāhmaṇa *Sāmanta* Gopāla were responsible for the recovery of the fortunes of the Chandellas, which had been temporarily eclipsed by the victories of the Kalachuri King Karṇa. The minister of Kīrttivarman

repeated the exploits of Paraśurāma, and "his merciless battle-axe spared neither women, child, nor old age, it cleft the broad shoulders of the enemy and its stroke was followed by a dreadful sound."<sup>57</sup> The Viruddhavidhamsa refers to the family of Skanda, a Nāgara Brāhmaṇa, which was responsible for the expansion of the Chāhamāna dynasty. Skanda and his grandsons, Skanda and Vāmana, served Someśvara and Prithvirāja III as ministers and valiant warriors.

The earlier *dharmaśāstras* were not unanimous on the propriety of becoming agriculturists in the case of Brāhmaṇas. Mm. Dr. Kane has discussed the conflicting views of these works.<sup>58</sup> He has not taken into consideration the views of Lakṣmīdhara and the author of the Śukranītisāra. Lakṣmīdhara quotes the liberal reformist Devala to show that the agricultural profession was permissible to the Brāhmaṇas, on fulfilment of certain conditions. If a Brāhmaṇa showed kindness to the oxen by neither putting unreasonably heavy load on them nor castrating them, gave them food and water at the proper time he might use them in ploughing and harvesting.<sup>59</sup> Further, no sin was incurred by tilling the soil, if the Brāhmaṇa agriculturist paid one-sixth of the produce of the land as tax to the King, one-twentieth to the Gods and one-thirtieth to the Brāhmaṇas.<sup>60</sup> The practice of tilling the lands by Brāhmaṇas is also recognised in the Śukranītisāra.<sup>61</sup> What Lakṣmīdhara and Śukra state was not merely a theory; it can be corroborated by inscriptional evidence. A grant issued in VS. 1202 during the reign of Chaulukya Kumārapāla tells us that Rājadeva, Śūradeva and possibly Nagada were Brāhmaṇa agriculturists.<sup>62</sup>

A Brāhmaṇa was allowed to maintain himself by trade in times of distress. But the ancient law-givers like Manu (X. 86-116), Gautama (VII. 8-14), Vaśiṣṭha (II. 31), Nārada (Ṛṇadāna 61-63) and Yājñavalkya<sup>63</sup> give a long list of articles which the Brāhmaṇas were forbidden<sup>64</sup> to sell. There was no change in these views even at the time of Lakṣmīdhara, 65

Alberuni also saw a similar state of affairs. He states that the Brāhmaṇas preferred to appoint Vaiśyas, who transacted business in their name. Yet some Brāhmaṇas tried their fortune in the trade of clothes and betelnut.<sup>66</sup> The Pehoa inscription of the ninth century records that Vāmuka, the son of Bhaṭṭa Viruka, was one of the horse-dealers, who assembled in the town of Prithūdaka.<sup>67</sup> It is interesting to note here that the sale of horses by Brāhmaṇas is forbidden in Manu (X.89) and this restriction was observed even in the days of Alberuni.

The two other occupations which a Brāhmaṇa followed for a living in times of distress were moneylending and service under the King.<sup>68</sup> There are plenty of evidences to show that they were appointed not only as ministers,<sup>69</sup> city-prefects,<sup>70</sup> *daṇḍanāyaka*<sup>71</sup> but also as sculptors<sup>72</sup> and composers of inscriptions.<sup>73</sup> Kalhaṇa notes that Śivaratha, a Brāhmaṇa, was appointed as a Kāyastha official.<sup>74</sup>

### *Privileges :*

The contemporary digests also show the continuation of the privileges of the Brāhmaṇas, as for example, of claiming reverence from all *varṇas* by the mere fact of birth, expounding the duty of all classes, freedom from death-sentence, exemption from taxes, precedence on the road, lesser punishment for certain offences in comparison with other castes, a shorter period of mourning etc.<sup>75</sup> There are certain exceptions to these rules. The rules of salutation did not apply to a person who ate and sold everything without discrimination and did not restrain his inclinations to break the rules.<sup>76</sup>

Amongst these privileges, the immunity of the Brāhmaṇas from taxation is also referred to by Alberuni<sup>77</sup> and the author of the *Mānasollāsa*.<sup>78</sup> But it is extremely unlikely that ordinary Brāhmaṇas enjoyed this privilege. Dr. Ghosal and Dr. Altekar<sup>79</sup> have rightly pointed out that neither the *Mahābhārata* and *Nārada-smṛiti* in earlier times nor the

South Indian inscriptions recorded in the thirteenth century A. D., show that all classes of Brāhmaṇas, irrespective of their professions, were exempted from taxation. However, it may be pointed out here that, some later inscriptions, e.g. one found in Gujarat, dated 1230 A. D. and two others in Orissa, dated 1436 and 1470 A. D., refer to such exemptions of Brāhmaṇas.<sup>80</sup> We should not take into consideration here the lands known as brahmadeya granted to individual Brāhmaṇas, who were undoubtedly given the privilege of non-payment of taxes.<sup>81</sup>

The exemption of the Brāhmaṇas from capital punishment is not only mentioned by Lakṣmīdhara, but also by Alberuni<sup>82</sup> and several other writers, like the authors of the Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra<sup>83</sup> and Laghvarhannitiśāstra.<sup>84</sup> All these writers state that the most severe punishment for a Brāhmaṇa was banishment. Alberuni informs us that if a Brāhmaṇa killed a man, the former had only to fast, pray and give alms. And if a Brāhmaṇa stole a valuable object, the King had the right to make him blind and cut off his left hand and right foot or right hand and left foot. On the other hand, the murderer of a Brāhmaṇa was the greatest sinner and performed the worst crime. This belief was so deep-rooted amongst the North Indian people, that Alberuni echoes it in the following lines: "nothing can wipe off any of the mortal crimes from a Brāhmaṇa, of which the greatest are: the murder of a Brāhmaṇa, called vajra-brahmahatyā".<sup>85</sup> It is interesting to record here that the Kubjikāmata is perhaps the only book which recommends that the sin of killing a Brāhmaṇa could be atoned by repeating a certain *mantra* 20,00,000 times.<sup>86</sup> But with regard to the question of immunity of a Brāhmaṇa desperado (ātatāyī) the digest-makers were divided in their opinions. While Sumantu quoted by Vijñeśvara permitted an ātatāyī Brāhmaṇa to be killed, Devannabhaṭṭa, the author of the Smritichandrikā, held<sup>87</sup> a contrary opinion. We have reasons to doubt how far the Brāhmaṇas enjoyed the privileges of not being killed. The

Rājatarāṅgiṇī records several instances when Brāhmaṇas were executed by naughty tyrants, and rebels.<sup>88</sup>

*Position in society :*

It appears that the Brāhmaṇas were the most respected caste in society. They were the intellectual class. But mere possession of knowledge and scholarship was not the sole cause of the ascendancy of the Brāhmaṇas. Traditional devotion undoubtedly helped them to maintain their position. The Rājadharmakāṇḍa of Lakṣmīdhara<sup>89</sup> and the Rājatarāṅgiṇī state that the Brāhmaṇas were still taking part in the coronation ceremony of the King. The Kashmiri Brāhmaṇas still possessed the right to select a King and reject the nominations of kings. They nominated the Brāhmaṇa ruler Yaśaskara (939-948 A. D.) in preference to Kamalavar-dhana.<sup>90</sup> It was during the reigning period of Harṣa that the Brāhmaṇas of Hiranyapura consecrated Uchchala as King.<sup>91</sup> The extent of their influence over Kings can be easily measured. Even during the fourteenth century A. D., the digestmakers advised consultation with the Brāhmaṇas before taking a decision. Chanḍeśvara holds that though the final decision rested with the King, yet he was advised to consult first with the ministers and then with the Brāhmaṇas.<sup>92</sup> The influence of the Brāhmaṇas on the kings of Bengal and Bihar continued to increase from the times of Pāla kings, who were mostly Buddhists. The family of Darbhapāṇi served four generations of Pāla rulers, beginning from Dharmapāla to Nārāyaṇapāla. There could be no greater testimony to the great authority of the Brāhmaṇa minister Darbhapāṇi than the fact recorded in the Badal pillar-inscription that he kept the Emperor Devapāla waiting at his door. The Sarnath image-inscription tells us that Mahīpāla I worshipped the lotus feet of his *guru* Vāmarāsi. Vāmarāsi seems to have been a Śaiva ascetic. The ascendancy of the Brāhmaṇas increased still further in the time of the Varma and Sena Kings. Bhavedeva Bhaṭṭa, Halāyudha and

Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa had enormous influence on the kings of the above-mentioned dynasties. The system of appointing Brāhmaṇa ministers on a hereditary basis was not followed in Bengal alone. The Chāhamāna Kings, Someśvara and Prithviraja III, appointed Skanda, his son Soḍha and grandsons Skanda and Vāmana as ministers.<sup>93</sup> Similarly, the Chaulukya Kings Mūlarāja I, Chāmuṇḍarāja and Bhīma II,<sup>94</sup> Kalachuri Kings Prithvīdeva I and Ratnadeva II of Ratanpur<sup>95</sup>, and almost all the Chandella kings<sup>96</sup> excepting Devavarman and Yaśovarman II favoured the appointment of Brāhmaṇa ministers on a hereditary basis.

### *Hunger-strike :*

The threat of hunger-strike was another great moral check on the despotism of tyrants and at the same time, a source of the influence of the Brāhmanical community. Sometimes, they fasted for a noble cause like the reconciliation of Ananta and Kalaśa<sup>97</sup>, or against imposition of forced labour in carrying loads by Harsa even on the Brāhmaṇas<sup>98</sup> or increase of imposts.<sup>99</sup> At times the members of the Purohitas' Corporation declared hunger-strike to win political struggles. The Brāhmaṇas enjoying endowments were induced twice to enter upon a solemn fast by the Pretender to the throne, named Vighraharāja, sometime immediately after the accession of Queen Diddā on the throne. But these fasts ended as soon as the Queen offered presents of gold.<sup>100</sup> Fasting was sometimes resorted to with a view to coercing the Government to do something which is not morally justifiable. The Brāhmaṇas of Rājānavāṭikā also threatened King Sussala by holding a fast in order that the King might punish ministers.<sup>101</sup> But when these Brāhmaṇas found the King supplicating them, they gave conflicting advice to that unfortunate King. The results were disastrous for the country. On the one hand, plundering became rampant and on the other, the violent *purohitas* behaved like a hostile army. "Worse than the Lavanya rebellion", writes Kalhaṇa, "was this rebellion for

the King, just as a disease of the throat pains more than one of the foot." At last, the King was forced to offer bribe of gold to the chief intriguers and thus the fast ended. Another mass fasting began in the reign of Bhikṣāchara when Tilaka's people plundered the Agrahāra of Akṣosuva.<sup>102</sup> Immediately the Brāhmaṇas holding *agrahāras* began solemn fasts against the King at Vijayesvara, Rājānavāṭikā and Gokula. They wanted the restoration of Sussala to the throne, and were even prepared to fight against the royal troops. Bhikṣachara could not succeed in putting an end to their fasting.<sup>103</sup> The power of the Brāhmaṇas remained unimpaired during the reign of Jayasinha. They opposed the appointment of Sujji as the Commander-in-Chief<sup>104</sup> and began a solemn fast in Maḍavarājya. They won another round of success when the King had to dismiss his minister Alankāra.<sup>105</sup> Further, it was only when the King promised to suppress the rebellion of Trillaka, that the Brāhmaṇas gave up their fasts at Vijayesvara.<sup>106</sup>

The effectiveness of these solemn fasts is also recorded in the Nadol stone-inscription of Rāyapāla, dated VS. 1198/1141 A. D. The Brāhmaṇas of the town of Dhalopa formed an organisation to detect cases of theft and made a solemn declaration to the effect that if any one amongst them refused to obey the order of the *Rājaka* to find out the lost property or resorted to self-immolation in protest against the search in his house, he would have to die like a cur, donkey or a *chaṇḍāla*.<sup>107</sup>

We find Brāhmaṇas as feudatory lords from the seventh century onwards. *Sāmanta* Lokanātha, a feudatory of the Khadga dynasty ruled the Tippera region.<sup>108</sup> Other feudatory lords were the father of Bhujaṅga in Kashmir,<sup>109</sup> *Thakuras* Devapālaśarman, Bālādityaśarman, Bhūpati, Srīdhara, Anantaśarman, Jayapālaśarman and Dalhū<sup>110</sup> under the Gāhaḍavālas and Rāutas Jāte Śarman<sup>111</sup> and Dādśarman<sup>112</sup> in the Uttar Pradesh.



The mediaeval digest like the *Dānakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara and the *Dānsagara* of Vallālasena held the ideal of the Mahābhārata that the possession of vast wealth was a source of calamity to a Brāhmaṇa. Hence a proper Brāhmaṇa donee, according to Lakṣmīdhara and Vallālasena should be one who was not only an erudite scholar and who led an austere life but also one who was suffering from poverty and hunger.<sup>113</sup> They also prescribe that the following articles should not be given away as *Dāna* e.g. gold, silver and copper to ascetics, cows, house, woman and a bed to a Brāhmaṇa donee.<sup>114</sup> But we find numerous Brāhmaṇas who had plenty of wealth and yet received donations. The Āvallika-panḍita Halāyudhaśarma of Bengal, received grants from the Queen-mother, Kumāra Puruṣottamasena and King Viśvarūpasena. He was also rich enough to purchase for himself as much as  $194\frac{3}{4}$  ( $165 + 10 + 7 + 12\frac{3}{4}$  Udānas) Udānas\* of land yielding an income of 240 Purāṇas.<sup>115</sup> Not only in Bengal but also in other parts of Northern India, there were Brāhmaṇas who held important posts in the Government and yet were recipients of donations. More than 20 villages were granted to Jāguśarma and his son Praharājaśarma, who were royal priests and received royal favours from four generations of Gāhaḍavāla kings, beginning from Madanapāla. Further the Brāhmaṇa *Senāpati* Madanapāla had no hesitation in receiving the village of Nandini from the Chandella King Paramardī sometime before VS 1228/1171 A. D.<sup>116</sup>

Some Brāhmaṇa officials and ministers were wealthy enough to gift away valuables and villages for building big temples. Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, the Minister of Peace and War, of

\* The unit of measurement of land, namely *Udāmāna*, *Unmāna* or *Udāna* has been interpreted by Dr. P. C. Chakravarti, as equivalent to 32 cubits, each cubit consisting of 12 angulas or digits (HB I. 653 f.n.1). But Dr. D. C. Sircar also suggests that one unit of *udāmna* or *udāna* was equivalent to 32 cubits, but each cubit consisting of 36 angulas or 27 inches. So according to Dr. Sircar, an *unmāna* or *udāna* is equivalent to 704 sq. cubits or 1/9th of a *bighā* of land (IHQ. XXVI, p. 311-12).

the Varman King Harivarman of Bengal, built the huge temple of Anantavāsudeva and adorned it with a tank and an excellent garden.<sup>117</sup> Another Bengal Brāhmaṇa, probably a teacher, was rich enough to build a temple and provide for an alms house and 7 *droṇas* of land for meeting the expenses of the worship of the deities.<sup>118</sup> Lakṣmīdhara, himself mentions in the beginning of Grihasthakāṇḍa, that he created numerous endowments in which the wives of *śrotriya*s lived happily with their families.<sup>119</sup> Keśava,<sup>120</sup> a Brāhmaṇa *Nāyaka* and Vāsudeva,<sup>121</sup> a *Daṇḍanāyaka*, also built temples in the times of Jayasinha Chedi and Vikramāditya Chālukya respectively. The Kashmiri Brāhmaṇas were no exception. The Samayamātrikā relates the story of a Benares Brāhmaṇa who used to feed one thousand Brāhmaṇas every day. The same book tells us that among the rich patrons of a prostitute was the son of a famous *guru*.<sup>122</sup> Again, when Prithvīrāja III had been killed and Hariṛāja was when placed on the throne of Śākambharī, Vāmana, the minister of Prithvīrāja retired to Anahillapāṭaka, according to verse 25 of the Viruddhavidhividhvāṇsa, with a huge sum of twenty laes and two thousand *drammas*.<sup>123</sup>

By the end of the period under survey we find that all the Brāhmaṇas did not belong to one unit. We have already seen that they came to be described according to their habitat, namely, Gauda, Pāśchōtya, Nāgera, Kanauj etc. The divisions and sub-divisions went on increasing. The distinction between high and low classes of Brāhmaṇas was maintained. Aparārka quoted with approval, the view of Yājñavalkya I. 224 that the *devalaka* (a Brāhmaṇa worshipping a deity for money continuously for three years) was so impure that on touching him it was necessary to have a bath to purify oneself. The Matsya Purāṇa (XVI.16) states that the Brāhmaṇas residing in Triśaṅku, Barbara, Odra (Orissa), Andhra, Takka, Drāviḍa and Koṅkaṇa were not to be invited to a funeral repast. The number of degraded Brāhmaṇas increased, if not in other parts of India, at least in Eastern

India. According to the Brihadharma Purāṇa, such degraded Brāhmanas were the astrologer class, worshipping the planets, and those who were born of Śākadvīpī-Devala Brāhmaṇas. The Brahmaparivarta Purāṇa refers to another class known as Bhaṭṭa Brāhmaṇas, who were born of a Sūta father and a Vaiśya mother.<sup>120</sup> The results of such ramifications were that the homogeneous character of society was altogether lost. It is difficult to understand the logic of the lawgivers who found no fault with a Brāhmaṇa engaged as a general or a royal officer, but degraded the persons, who lived by teaching or acting as priests of the non-Brāhmanical community.

### *Kṣatriya :*

Dr. Ghurye is of opinion that the Kṣatriyas had a shadowy existence from about the eleventh century A.D.<sup>126</sup> He gives several reasons. The traditional account of their total extermination by Paraśurāma, their rout caused by the inroads of the Hūṇas, their support to Buddhism, and the defeat of the Hindu sovereigns at the hands of the Turko-Afghans helped to convince "the Paṇḍits of the extinction of the Kṣatriyas." Kamalākara grudgingly accepted their existence as a rare phenomenon in the seventeenth century A.D.<sup>127</sup> But there is a plethora of inscriptional evidence to show that the Kṣatriya was not at all a shadowy figure in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In the Pāla records, there is mention of only one Kṣatriya, named *Mahāsāmantādhipati* Nārāyaṇavarman in the Khalimpur copper-plate. But in other parts of Northern India, many Kṣatriyas continued to exist. The Shāhiya princes and other Kṣatriyas took shelter in Kashmir, when the Punjab and Afghanistan were occupied by the Turko-Afghans.<sup>128</sup> Contemporary inscriptions refer to Kṣatriyas living in the kingdom of Jayachandra Gāhaḍavāla,<sup>129</sup> in the Chandella kingdom under Madanavarman<sup>130</sup> and at Gwalior under the Paramāras.<sup>131</sup>

The Kṛtyakalpataru and the Grihastharatnākara acquaint us with the duties and privileges of the Kṣatriyas. As the

name Kṣatriya was derived from the words "*Kṣatāt trāṇam*", it was their duty to protect the men of other three *varṇas*. Quoting Manu, Parāśara, Paithīnāsī, Hārīta, Baudhāyana, Āpastamba and Devala, Lakṣmīdhara prescribes that as kings their special duties are to bear arms and rule the country righteously, settle disputes between litigants and protect the *varṇaśramadharmā*. It was the duty of ordinary Kṣatriyas to fight unto the last and never to run away from the battlefield. In addition to this Devala prescribes that a Kṣatriya should worship gods and serve the cause of the Brāhmanas. In this period he had all the privileges of the Brāhmanas excepting teaching and sacrificing. He enjoyed the right to learn the Vedas, but not to impart instructions in them.<sup>133</sup> Their curriculum of studies included prominently the study of the art of war (dhanurveda).

The digests allowed the Kṣatriyas to follow the profession of an agriculturist only in times of distress.<sup>134</sup> During the reign of Bhoja, we find a Kṣatriya's son named Memmāka cultivating a field in Gwalior area.<sup>135</sup>

Devala prescribes that a Kṣatriya should never beg. Lakṣmīdhara quotes Devala with approval, but he allows him the privilege of receiving gifts.<sup>136</sup> Vallālasena in his *Dānasāgara* also relates such a practice. King Jayachandra granted several villages in the Antardvī region to Rāuta Rājyadhara-varman, a Kṣatriya.<sup>137</sup> Inscriptions also refer to such a practice. King Jayachandra granted several villages in the Antardvī region to Rāuta Rājyadhara-varman, a Kṣatriya of the Vatsa *gotra* in between the years VS 1233/1177 A.D. and 1236/1180 A.D. on important occasions like *Uttarāyaṇasamkrānti* and full moon day of the month of Vaiśākha.<sup>138</sup>

With regard to the question of the relative position of the Kṣatriyas in the social hierarchy all the digest-makers unanimously hold that the Brāhmanas are superior. The *Sukranītiśāra* recommended the old principle of the *Mahā-Bhārata* (XII. 79. 15-20) that a Brāhmaṇa incurred no sin if he killed a wicked Kṣatriya in war.<sup>139</sup> But with

regard to punishment, the Kṣatriyas enjoyed some special privileges, possibly because they constituted the prop of the defence force of the State. Alberuni informs us that on being convicted for theft a Brāhmaṇa could be blinded, whereas a Kṣatriya was merely maimed in the right hand and left foot. Further, no capital punishment could be awarded to them even for the most heinous crime.<sup>140</sup>

The ruling (Rajput) families of Northern India, namely, Guhilas, Gurjara-Pratihāras, Chāpas, Chāhamānas, Chaulukyas, Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Chandellas, Paramāras, Kachhapaghāṭas, and Gāhaḍavālas called themselves Rajputs. Inscriptions of these dynasties claim that they rose from the sacred fire kindled on Mt. Abu by the sage, Vasiṣṭha. Originally there were four clans. It has been rightly pointed out by Dr. U. N. Ghosal that it is not possible to agree with Smith's view that four of the principal Rajput clans, namely, the Paramāras, Chaulukyas, Chāhamānas and Pratihāras were descendants of Hinduised foreigners like Hūṇas and Gurjaras.<sup>141</sup> Kalhana speaks of thirty-six original Rajput tribes.<sup>142</sup> Whatever might have been the origin of the Rajputs, they occupied an important position in the social fabric. The Kathāsaritsāgara tells us stories of valiant Rajput guards.<sup>143</sup> The Kinsariya inscription dated 1003 A.D. refers to the Dahiya Rajputs, who were feudatories of the Chāhamānas and constructed temples and steepwells.<sup>144</sup>

#### *Vaiśyas :*

Though the Vaiśyas continued to be counted as a separate caste in the digests up to the end of the seventeenth century, a tendency manifested itself very early to degrade them to the Śūdra community. The approximation of the Vaiśyas to the Śūdras began as early as Manu<sup>145</sup> and Boudhayana-dharma sutra.<sup>146</sup> Dr. Altekar and Ghurye rightly hold that the Vaiśyas were levelled down to the position of the Śūdras.<sup>147</sup> Hemādri lumps together the goldsmith caste with that of the washerman, cobbler, actor<sup>148</sup> etc. More than three hundred years before Hemādri, Devala assigned to the Vaiśya the professions of carrier, dancer, vocal and instrumen-

tal musician and wrestler. Devala has been quoted with approval by Lakṣmīdhara.<sup>149</sup> Alberuni also did not find any difference between the Vaiśyas and Śūdras. If men belonging to either of these castes recited the Vedas, their tongues were cut off by the ruler.<sup>150</sup> He categorically states: "Between the latter two classes there is no very great distance. Much however, as these classes differ from each other, they live together in the same town and villages, mixed together in the same houses and lodgings."<sup>151</sup> The truth of this statement, however, is very questionable, as even in the middle of the twentieth century, when laws make untouchability a penal offence and inter-caste marriage a perfectly legal affair, Śūdras and Vaiśyas do not mix together in the same houses and lodgings. There were minor distinguishing features between the Vaiśyas and Śūdras. According to Alberuni, a Vaiśya girded himself with a single *yajñopavita* made of two cords, but a Śūdra used the thread made of linen.<sup>152</sup> Moreover, even in the days of Lakṣmīdhara, the Śūdra had freedom to sell all kinds of goods, the Vaiśyas were forbidden to carry on transactions in some specified articles like salt, wine, meat, curds, swords, arrows, water, idols etc.<sup>153</sup> Lakṣmīdhara here differs from Manu and Medhātithi,<sup>154</sup> because they allowed Vaisyas to trade in most of these articles. In this case a positive evidence of the attempt to relegate some of the castes dealing in the articles stated above is noticeable in the twelfth century. Similarly in Bengal, Vallālasena is said to have avenged an insult to him by degrading the Suvarṇavanikas or goldsmith caste to such an inferior status that the drinking of water touched by them was prohibited for the higher castes.

### *Kāyasthas :*

The Kāyasthas were originally officials of a king or a feudatory chieftain. Their earliest mention is in the earlier Smritis like Yājñavalkya.<sup>155</sup> But the epigraphic use of the word is as late as the Gupta period. Their main functions were not only to write documents but also to be officers in

charge of record, accounts and revenue departments, to help the judges and serve as the dewan or *gumastha* of the Moghul times. It is in this sense that earlier mediæval writers refer to a Kāyastha. Harisena, the Jaina writer of the Brihatkathakośa (931-932 A.D.) used the words Lekhaka and Kāyastha as synonymous.<sup>156</sup> Inscriptions of the tenth and thirteenth centuries reveal that they were writers of legal documents,<sup>157</sup> and also officers to whom information of grants was given.<sup>158</sup> From the days of Yājñavalkya (1.336) to the times of Vijñāneśvara, we find frequent references to the rapacity of these Kāyastha officials. The latter author explains the cause of their opportunity to oppress the people by their influence on the king and their fraudulent nature. The Rājatarāṅgiṇī very frequently refers to unscrupulous oppression by the Kāyasthas.

*As a caste :*

But from about the ninth century A.D. the Kāyasthas came to exist as a caste. Much earlier to the inscriptional references to their origin, the two later smritis Uśanas and Vedavyāsa, refer to the Kāyastha as a caste. The Vedavyāsa *smṛiti* includes the Kāyasthas among the Śūdras along with barbers, potters and others. The Uśanas says that the word Kāyastha is "compound of the first three letters of Kāka (Crow), Yama and *Sthapati* to convey the three attributes of greed, cruelty and spoliation (or paring) characteristics of the three".<sup>159</sup> Śrīharṣa traces the origin of Kāyasthas to Chitrugupta, the scribe of Yama.<sup>160</sup> But inscriptional reference to this caste occurs for the first time as late as the eleventh century A.D. In one inscription the genealogy is traced back to its founder Kuśa and his father Kāśyapa.<sup>161</sup> In another version we are told that those Kṣatriyas who were created by Brahmā and were fearless even after the extermination by Paraśurāma, were called Kāyasthas.<sup>162</sup> The Rewa inscription dated KS 800/1048-49 A.D. gives another account of the origin of Kāyasthas. A sage named Kāchāra, while

living in the town of Kulañcha, being pleased with the services of a Śūdra granted him the boon of a son who became the ancestor of the caste of Kāyasthas. As the Śūdra had innumerable merits in his body (kāya), so his descendants were known as Kāyasthas.<sup>163</sup> Sodḍhala, the author of the Udayasundarīkathā traces the origin of his family from Kalāditya, who was the brother of King Śilāditya and an incarnation of the *gaṇa* of Maheśvara called Kāyastha. It is interesting to note that Kalāditya has been described as an ornament of the Kṣatriyas.<sup>164</sup> Other theories of the origin of the caste have been advanced by Dr. Bhandarkar, the Vaṅgadeśīya Kāyasthasabhā and the *Kulajis* of Bengal. The contributors to the History of Bengal and Sankalia have rejected the *Kulaji* story of Kāyasthas, being descendants of the five attendants of the five Brāhmaṇas brought by Ādiśūra. Dr. D. C. Sircar<sup>165</sup> has rightly rejected the theory of their connections with Persian rulers or kings.

The Kāyasthas became a caste during the period under survey. As with the Brāhmaṇas, they came to be known as Gauḍa, Kāyastha-vaiṇśa, Mathurāṇvaya-kāyastha, Kāyastha-Kāṭāriyāṇvaya, Srivāstava and Naigama-kāyastha according to their original habitat. The Bengal Kāyasthas, known to Mediaeval India as Gauḍa Kāyasthas, were expert scribes. On and from the date of the composition of the Apsad inscription of Ādityasena, they rendered their expert services to the ruling kings and feudatories in writing eulogies even outside Bengal. The Dewal *prasasti* in the Pilibhit district of the U. P. was written by the Gauḍa Karaṇika Takṣāditya<sup>166</sup> (992 A.D.). The Gauḍa Kāyasthas also rendered services to the Chāhamānas of Śākambharī and Naddūla by writing the Kinsariya<sup>167</sup> (999 A.D.), Delhi-Siwalik<sup>168</sup> (1163) and *Nadol*<sup>169</sup> inscriptions for Kings Durlabharāja, Viśaladeva and Rāyāpāla respectively. Two others, namely Paṇḍit Mahīpāla and Mahākṣapaṭalika Mahādeva wrote the Nadol and Nanana grants for the feudatory chief Pratāpasimha<sup>170</sup> and his master, the Chalukya King Kumārapāla<sup>171</sup> in VS 1213 and 1212/1156



A.D. The Gauḍa Kāyasthas also travelled to the courts of Chandella and Kalachuri kings. The Karaṇika Jaddha wrote the Khajuraho inscription<sup>172</sup> (A.D.954) in pleasing letters for King Dhaṅga. When this document was renewed in VS 1173/1117 A.D., by Jayavarman, it was also re-written by another Gauḍa scribe named Jayapāla.<sup>173</sup> Pratirāja engraved the Pendrabandh plates of the Kalachuri King Pratāpamalla<sup>174</sup> (1214 A.D.) of Ratanpur.

These Gauḍa scribes were men of learning. An inscription of Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla dated 1129-30 A.D. refers to Kāyastha Śūrāditya as proficient in all śāstras.<sup>175</sup> While Jaddha of the tenth century A.D. was proficient in the Sanskrit language, Pratirāja of the early thirteenth century A.D. describes himself as an ocean of learning and light of Karaṇa community.<sup>176</sup> The members of the family of Gadādhara, who served as a minister of the Chandellas, are described as *kavichakravartīs*.<sup>177</sup> Mahādeva, the composer of the Kinsariya inscription was a poet. Hence it is not surprising that it was at the request of Pāṇḍu-dāsa that Śrīdhara wrote Nyāyakandalī in 991 A.D.. One inscription at least refers to their charitable disposition.<sup>178</sup> Being pleased with the services of the scribe Pethada, the feudatory title of *Thakkura* was conferred on him by the Chāhamāna feudatory King Rāyapāla of Naḍḍūla.<sup>179</sup> Further, Kāyastha Gadādhara held the position of Minister of Peace and War under the Chandella King Paramardideva..<sup>180</sup>

With regard to the Vāstavya or Śrīvāstava Kāyasthas we do not get definite information about their original habitat. The Ajaigadh stone-inscription refers to the fact that Nāna's ancestors were inhabitants of Kausāmyapura or Kosam in the Allahabad district originally.<sup>181</sup> If we take this region as the original habitat of the Śrīvāstavas, they were responsible for writing inscriptions in their own home province, Uttar Pradesh. Three inscriptions were written by these Vāstavya Kāyasthas for the Gāhaḍavāla kings Govindachandra and Jayachchandra and also the Sahet Mahet inscription<sup>182</sup> dated 1276 VS/1219-29 A.D. The existence of other responsible

members of this community is recorded in the Meohar<sup>183</sup> and Gadhwa<sup>184</sup> inscriptions. Paṁsūha wrote the Ajaygaḍh inscription, dated VS 1345/1288 A.D., for Nāna, the minister of the Chandella King Bhojavarman.<sup>185</sup> A hereditary family of scribes, represented by Kīrtidhara, Vatsarāja, Dharmarāja Chitrabhānu, Devagaṇa and Ratnaśiṁha, served four generations of the Kalachuri kings of Ratanpur, beginning from Jājalladeva I in VS 866/1114 A.D..<sup>186</sup> Śrī Sujāna wrote in VS 1254/1197 A.D. the Sone East Bank copper-plate for his master Udayarāja, a feudatory of Indradhavalā in Sahabad region in Bihar.<sup>187</sup>

Members of the Vāstavya community rose to a very high position. They enjoyed the feudatory status of *Thakkura* under the Gāhaḍavāla Kings Govindachandra<sup>188</sup> and Jayachandra<sup>189</sup>, and the Chandella King Bhojavarman<sup>190</sup> and as an official under Indradhavalā,<sup>191</sup> a feudatory of Jayachandra. Two of them were scribes. It is possible that because of their services, the king raised them to a higher status. Some members of this community were rewarded with bigger and still more responsible posts in the Chandella Kingdom. The Ajaigadh rock-inscription of the time of Bhojavarman<sup>192</sup> acquaints us with the role of a Vāstavya family, which seems to have migrated from Takkārikā. Their genealogy begins with the name of *Thakkura* Jājuka who held a position of trust under Gaṇḍa some time between 1002 and 1010 A. D. He not only received a grant from the King but also was appointed to the position of *sarvādhi-karaṇa* (V. 6). From him was descended Maheśvara who like his father received the endowment of the village of Pipalahikā and was appointed as the *viśiṣa* of the fortress of Kalanjar (V. 89). Gadādhara, the next member, became the counsellor and chamberlain of King Paramardideva (V. 10). His brothers, Jaunadhara and Mālādhara were valiant warriors (V. 11-12). The fortune of the family probably sank down for a short period. It again rose with Vāse, who was appointed as the *viśiṣa* of Jayapura (at present

Ajaigaḍh) by King Trailokyavarman. He also received the grant of a village named Varbhavari. Thanks to his bravery, the rebellion of Bhojuka was crushed. The inscription also tells us that it was he who saved the kingdom of Trailokyavarman from foreign enemies (V. 19-20). His younger brother, Ānanda as governor of the fort of Jayadurga also played the part of saviour of the Chandella territory by subduing the wild tribes of Bhillas, Śabaras and Pulindas (V. 21-22). Subhaṭa, the grandson of Ānanda was a minister and superintendent of treasury of King Bhojavarman. Another family, which served Bhojavarman and his ancestor was that of Nāna. From the other Ajaigaḍh stone-inscription, dated in VS 1345/1288, it appears that Nāna and his brothers served the Chandella kings as ministers.<sup>193</sup> The history of these two families show that the Vāstavyas could become valiant soldiers. For two generations Vāse and Ānanda held the post of governors of the fortress of Ajaigaḍh. When a change of the Governor of the fortress was made, *Ṭhakkura* Ayo, who was also a Vāstavya Kāyastha, was appointed as the *durgādhipa* by King Bhojavarman. They were equally good with pen and intricacies of diplomacy. Nāna was not only a teacher of religious laws but also an adept in all the fine arts. The members of the family of Dharmarāja, the hereditary scribes of the Kalachuri kings of Ratanpur, were good poets.<sup>194</sup>

Like the Gauḍa Kāyasthas, the Vāstavyas also were rich enough to build temples. Thus the temple of Siddheśvara (Mahādeva) in the village of Mehavada in the Allahabad district<sup>195</sup> or a Śiva temple in the village of Sām̐ba in Ratanpur<sup>196</sup> and two other *devālayas* including that of Hari in Ajaigaḍh are referred to in inscriptions.<sup>197</sup>

Another sub-caste of the Kāyasthas was the Mathur-āṇvaya-kāyasthas, who probably were original settlers of Mathura.<sup>198</sup> So far as inscriptional reference to them as scribes is concerned, the earliest one is the mention of Baijuka, who composed the Batihagarh stone-inscription<sup>199</sup> in VS 1385/1328 A.D. As a feudal vassal, with the title of *Ṭhakkura*, the name of one

Udayasiha is mentioned in the Bhinmal inscription of *Mahārājādhirāja* Udayasinha<sup>200</sup> of Rajputana. Manoratha rose to the coveted post of secretary to Bhuvanapāla-Mahipāla, the Kachchhapa ghāṭa ruler of Gwalior.<sup>201</sup>

The Kātāriya Kāyasthas are referred to the Balvan inscription,<sup>202</sup> dated VS 1345/1289 A.D. in Kotah, Rajputana. According to this inscription, the ancestors of Narapati, who belonged to that community, lived originally at Mathura (V. 13). This Narapati was the Chief Minister of the last two Chāhamāna kings, Jaitrasinha and Hammira of Ranthambhor.

The Naigama Kāyasthas, so far as the inscriptional information is concerned, are referred to as scribes. They wrote the Nadol plates of Chāhamāna Kīrttipāla and Alhaṇa-deva in VS 1218/c.<sup>203</sup> 1160-61 A.D. and Bijholi inscription<sup>204</sup> dated VS 1226/1170 A.D.

The other sub-castes of the Kāyasthas were Saksenā<sup>205</sup> and Vūlabhya or Valabha. The latter wrote the charters of the Paramāra Kings Bhoja<sup>206</sup> and Vijayapāla,<sup>207</sup> Māṇḍalika, a feudatory of Paramāra King Jayasinha,<sup>208</sup> and the Sanjan plate of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Amoghavarṣa I<sup>209</sup> Guṇadhavala, writer of the above-mentioned Sanjan plate enjoyed the position of a judge and *senābhogika*.

Another sub-section of the Kāyasthas seem to have been the Karaṇa Kāyasthas. The Karaṇas as an official class played an important role in the history of Northern India. That they were officials is evident from the mention of Karaṇa-Kāyastha Naradatta in the Gupta times.<sup>210</sup> Karaṇa as a name of a caste seems to have been as old as Gautama (IV. 7), Yājñavalkya (I. 92) and Manu (X. 22). They were born either of Vrātya Kṣatriya parents or of Vaiśya male and Śūdra female. The Brihaddharma Purāṇa includes them in the Śūdra caste. Mediaeval lexicographers identify the Karaṇas with Kāyasthas. Kṣīrasvāmin, the commentator of the Amarakośa and Vaijayantī holds similar view.<sup>211</sup> The close identity between these two is also proved by the

inscriptions of the times of Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla<sup>212</sup> and Bhojavarman Chandella.<sup>213</sup> In the inscriptions of the Chamba valley we find mention of two Karaṇa Kāyasthas.<sup>214</sup> But it cannot be said definitely that the merger of the Kāyasthas and Karaṇikas or Karaṇas became a settled fact in Northern India even by the end of the twelfth century. Men of the other higher or lower castes held the post of Karaṇikas. The donee of the Nidhanpur copper-plates, who held the post of Nyāyakaraṇika, was a Brāhmaṇa.<sup>215</sup> Another Karaṇika Brāhmaṇa is referred to in the Dhod (Udaipur, Rajputana) inscription, as having sold his house to the temple of Nityapramoditadeva, sometime before VS 1228/1171<sup>216</sup> A.D. Our statement is further corroborated by the fact that the author of the medical treatise Śabdapradīpa describes himself as belonging to a Karaṇa family.<sup>217</sup> He himself, his father and grandfather were Court-physicians to the Bengal kings, Rāmapāla and Govindachandra. We have already seen that the Brīhaddharma Purāṇa regards the Ambaśṭhas as belonging to the *Uttamasāṅkara* caste and practising the profession of physician. If the evidence of the Prabandha-chintāmaṇi be taken as correct, Umāpatidhara, the Chief Minister of Lakṣmaṇasena, was a Karaṇa Kāyastha. Dr. Niharranjan Ray thinks that during the Sena times, Śālāḍḍa-nāga, mentioned in Vijayasena's Barrackpur grant, Harighoṣa, the *sandhivigrahika* of Vallālasena, Sandhivigrahika Nāñyī-siṃha and Kopiviṣṇu under Viśvarūpasena were Karaṇa-kāyasthas.<sup>218</sup> It is very likely that by the end of the twelfth century A.D., the process of identifying the Karaṇas and the Kāyasthas as belonging to the same caste had begun.

As we have got reference to the Gauḍa Kāyasthas in the Aḥṣad inscription, dated 672 A.D., it is not correct to say that the "earliest known epigraphical reference to Kāyastha caste" occurs in a Rāṣṭrakūṭa charter of 871<sup>219</sup> A.D. It is interesting to note that none of the sub-sections of the Kāyasthas like Vālabha, Naigama, or Māthura ever wrote any charter of the kings of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Assam.

In Gujarat, we find mention of only two sub-sections, namely, Gauda and Vālabha, as writers of charters. Inscriptions also show that the sub-sections, known as Māthura, Kāṭāriya, Naigama, and Śaksenā Kāyasthas, performed the duties of scribes in the twelfth century. Their activities were confined mainly within the kingdoms of the Chāhamānas and Kachchhapaghāṭas.

It seems that the Kāyasthas did not form themselves into a caste in Kashmir. None of the abovementioned sub-sections is mentioned in any inscription or literature relating to Kashmir. The Kashmiris understood Kāyasthas to be officials, about whose nature and conduct we have plenty of information. Our surmise is substantiated by the fact that Kalhaṇa tells us that the hereditary occupation of Kāyastha (official) Bhadreśvara was that of a "gardener", trading in night soil, selling fuel and acting as a butcher<sup>220</sup> and another Kāyastha official named Śivaratha, who was a Brāhmaṇa by caste.<sup>221</sup>

### *Vaidyas*

We have already seen that the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of the Brihaddharma Purāṇa and the earlier Uśanas-smṛiti refer to the Vaidyas. But, though both the texts refer to their profession as physicians, yet they state their origins differently. According to both the authorities, their father was a Brāhmaṇa, but while the former describes their mother as a Vaiśya, the latter says that she was a Kṣatriya. The contributors to the History of Bengal (Vol. I) and Dr. D. C. Sircar have shown that inspite of the reference in three South Indian inscriptions of the eighth century A.D. and the Bhatera copper-plate, the Vaidyas and Ambasthas, who were physicians, did not exist as a caste upto the end of the twelfth century<sup>222</sup> A.D.

Neither in Bengal nor in other parts of Northern India, the physicians formed themselves into a caste. It is because of their profession that the Bhiṣakas and Vaidyas were informed

of the charters granted by the kings of the Gāhadavāla,<sup>228</sup> Paramāras of Vāgaḍa<sup>229</sup> and Chaudella dynasties.<sup>230</sup>

### *Śūdras :*

The position of the Śūdras improved from the days of Medhātithi. An undercurrent of respect for them flows in their digests.<sup>231</sup> Birth alone ceased to be the criteria. Lakṣmīdhara, quoting Hārita, tells us that a pure minded Śūdra was better than a bad and notorious Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya or a Vaiśya<sup>232</sup>. The Śūdras became free from certain disabilities. Medhātithi and Viśvarūpa hold that they can neither be enslaved nor be made dependent on a Brāhmaṇa. He can be a teacher in grammar and other sciences, perform rites which are allowed to all classes in the *Smṛitis*, utter the names of deities, according to the views of revered teachers and observe the *nāmakaraṇ* and other sacraments without uttering the mantras.<sup>233</sup> Lakṣmīdhara in his Grihasthakaṇḍa denies all these rights to the Śūdras. Quoting Vyāsa, he says that, a Śūdra can sell meat and need not perform *saṁskāras* like *upanayana* and *agnihotra* rites.<sup>234</sup> But elsewhere in the Niyatakālakāṇḍa section of the Kṛtya-kalpataru, Lakṣmīdhara permits removal of disabilities regarding partaking of food. Directly contrary to the rule of Manu. Lakṣmīdhara emphasises that the Śūdra commits no sin if he gives rice for getting it cooked to a Brāhmaṇa at the latter's house.<sup>235</sup> Further, he approves the rules of Yājñavalkya, Devala and Aṅgira, who prescribe that a Brāhmaṇa can take the meals offered by cowherds, peasants, barbers, and potters, but not by dancers, actors, carpenters, cobblers, musicians, blacksmiths, weavers, washermen, garland-makers, painters, cart-drivers and oilmillers.<sup>236</sup> It is interesting to note here that he approves of the dictum of Parāśara to the effect that a plate of rice, though cooked by a Śūdra, may be purified by the touch of a Brāhmaṇa. It becomes *haviḥ* (sacrificial offering) and can be taken by men of the highest *varṇa*. Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva also quotes the abovementioned passage of

Parāśara, but he prescribes a *Krichchhra* penance for a Brāhmaṇa for taking food, cooked by a Śūdra.

The social and political status and economic condition of the Śūdras will also show, that they were neither down-trodden nor a community living in poverty. They were forbidden to assume the role of a Kṣatriya, but there are plenty of instances to prove that they fought as soldiers.<sup>232</sup>

The Śūdras were the most numerous section in the community. Their number increased from age to age. Some of them have been regarded as mixed castes. These were born of hypergamous unions of upper caste males with lower caste females or of marriages in the inverse order. The Vaijayanti enumerates as many as 64 *jātis*. It has been shown in the History of Bengal (Vol. I. p. 567 ff) that the Brihad-dharma and Brahmaivaivarta Purāṇas gave a different enumeration of mixed castes. The former Purāṇa<sup>234</sup> mentions three grades, the first one comprised as many as twenty *uttama-saṅkaras*, the second one of twelve *mudhyama-saṅkaras* and the third one of nine *adhama-saṅkaras* or *antyajas*. The list is merely illustrative. Both Vijñāneśvara and the author of the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, state that the mixed castes are innumerable.<sup>235</sup> A detailed comparison between the different grades of Śūdras, as described in the Brahmaivaivarta and Brihaddharma Purāṇas, has been made by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Dr. Hazra and Dr. Niharranjan Roy. They have shown that both the Purāṇas hold largely the same view regarding the *antyajas* whose position was below the *asat-śūdras*. They were Vyādha, Bhaḍa, Kola, Koṇcha, Haḍḍi, Doma, Jolā, Bāgatita (Bāgdi ?) Vyālagrāhī (Vediā ?), and Chaṇḍālas. The list agrees with Bhavadeva's who classifies the Chaṇḍālas with Kaibaritta, Pukkasa, Kāpālīka, Naṭa, Nartaka, Takṣaṇa, Charmakāra, Suvarṇṇakāra, Śauṇḍika and Rajaka. Some of these people like washermen, leather-workers, Veṇas, Burulas, fishermen (Kaivartta), Medas, Bhillas have also been considered as *antyajas* in the Vaijayantī. That the *antyajas* were beyond the four orders or *varṇas* is also observed by Alberuni.



Alberuni found two classes amongst those who were not reckoned in any caste or guild. In the first group belonged fuller shoe-maker, juggler, basket and shield-maker, sailor, fishermen, hunter of wild animals and of birds and the weaver. The second group consisted of the people called Hāḍi, Ḍoma (Ḍomba), Chaṇḍāla and Badhatau.

*Svarṇakāra, Pīṭalāhāra and Rūpakāra :*

According to the Brahmavaivarta and the Brihaddharma Purāṇas, the Gandhavaṇika, Śaṅkhika, Kāṁsyakāra, Suvarṇakāra and Svarṇakāra, were all Śūdras. The latter Purāṇa classifies the first of these castes as *uttama* (high)-*śaṅkaras* born of the union of a Brāhmaṇa father and Vaiśya mother and the last two, that is, goldsmith and trader, in bullion as *madhyamaśaṅkara* and being born of Ambaṣṭha father and Vaiśya mother.<sup>237</sup> The Kāṁsyakāra and the Śaṅkhikas or workers in brass and shells, were not always poor. The former is mentioned in the Bhatera copper-plate of Govinda-keśava and the latter in the Somnath temple-inscription, as donors of houses.<sup>238</sup> With regard to the goldsmiths an attempt was made in the seventeenth century Bengal to raise their status higher in the hierarchy of castes. The Vallālacharita of Ānandabhaṭṭa tells us that Vallālasena had particular animosity against the Suvarṇavaṇiks or traders in bullion for several reasons. Vallabhānanda, the rich merchant of Saṅka-koṭa agreed to lend a crore and a half of gold coins to Vallālasena on condition of receiving the revenues of Harikeli. They further enraged the King by refusing to sit along with the *Sat-Śūdras* in a dinner. They had also alliance with the Pāla kings. So the Sena King ordered that those bullion-traders should be deprived of their holy thread. Almost all the historians<sup>239</sup> have belived this story as particularly true. But the attitude of the smṛitis to the Suvarṇakāras and Svarṇakāra do not reveal that they were above the Śūdras. Manu (IV. 215), Yājñavalkya (I. 163), Śaṅkha and Sumantu quoted by Aparārka (Pp. 1175-76), and Bhavadeva and Hemādri place them

on a level with Karmakāra, Niṣāda, washermen, actors Kaivartas, tailors, Medas and Bhillas.<sup>240</sup> The main reason for assigning them to the lowest class was theft of gold. We have a brilliant satire on the goldsmiths written by Kṣemendra in Canto VIII of Kalāvīlāsa. He knew the sixty-four arts including twelve of movements, six of hissing, eleven of new ways of deception and five of reducing weight. The Suvarṇakāras made donations of images.<sup>241</sup> It is interesting to note that in Orissa as many as three inscriptions<sup>242</sup> were incised by the goldsmiths and bullion traders. This fact shows that the goldsmiths had already formed themselves into a caste in Orissa.

The Pitalahāra or coppersmiths also rendered services to the kings. Three Chandella inscriptions tell us of the services of Pālhaṇa, who incised grants.<sup>243</sup>

Like the Pitalahāra, the Rūpakāra also engraved inscriptions of Kalachuri kings of Ratanpur<sup>244</sup> and Paramāra kings of Malwa. They also carved out images of Nilakaṇṭha<sup>245</sup> and Jina<sup>246</sup> in the kingdom of the Chandellas.

#### *Grades of Untouchables :*

There were other grades of untouchables. In the days of the composition of the early smṛitis untouchables were called *antyajas*. The enumerations of the sub-divisions of these *antyajas* differ, once from another. Atri mentions seven. The Vedavyāsa-smṛiti counts twelve names and also includes all those who eat cow's flesh as *antyajas*.<sup>247</sup> Alberuni tells us that the following eight groups of people, who were members of crafts and professions, but did not belong to the fourfold caste system, were: fuller or washermen, shoemaker, juggler, basket and shield-maker, sailor, fishermen, hunter of wild animals and birds, and weavers. These correspond to Rajaka, Charmakāra, Naṭa or Sailushika, Buruḍa, Nāvika, Kaivarta, Bhillas and Kuvindaka, who have been regarded as Chaṇḍālas and *antyajas* in all early smṛiti texts. But Manu (VIII. 279) regards them as Śūdras and

thus they belonged to the lowest caste. Some of the *antyajas* like weavers are included as *uttamasaiikaras* and boatmen and leather-workers as *adhamasankura* grades of Śūdras in the Brihaddharma Purāṇa.

It would seem that the position of the *antyajas* has always been pitiable and they have been regarded as untouchables in the community. But a closer study of the *smṛitis* show that their status had improved in course of time. Dr. P. V. Kane interpreting the information given in Manu (X. 36, 51) Hārita and Āngirasa, has rightly observed that the seven well-known *antyajas* "were not so untouchable in the times of Medhātithi and Kullūkabhāṭṭa.<sup>248</sup> "By improvement he means that their touch was not so polluting as to require an actual bath.

Inscriptions of the period under survey inform us that the above-mentioned crafts were at the mercy of kings. The oilmillers and florists were asked by their kings to make donations to the temples.<sup>249</sup> Sometimes a King like Govinda-keśava gave away houses belonging to washermen, ivory-workers and boatmen to a Śaiva temple.<sup>250</sup> Their helpless existence further worsened when the kings assigned the whole-time services of washermen or gardeners to the requirements of a temple institution. It seems that Raṭṭarāja, the Śilāhāra chieftain, assigned one family each of washermen, potters, gardeners and oilmen to the services of the Karkaroni branch of the Mattamayūra Śaiva āchāryas.<sup>251</sup>

Kṣemendra in his Samayamātrikā states that a barber is the usual friend of passionate people and teacher of prostitutes.<sup>252</sup> The florists and betel-sellers agreed to supply, free or charge, flowers and betels required for the worship of deities in Gwalior and the Uttar Pradesh.<sup>253</sup> Several *rathakāras* living at Samderaka gave a piece of land measuring one *haela* of *yugāmdhari* for the Kalyāṇika festival in Rajputana.<sup>254</sup> The oil-millers did not lag behind others in contributing towards the maintenance of temples.<sup>255</sup> Some of them, like Jāna, the Paṭṭakila was rich enough to erect a temple of Śambhu in Rajputana.<sup>256</sup>

*Kaivartas :*

The position of the Kaivartas, Mālākāras (florists), Kumbhakāra (potters) seems to have been improved during the Sena regime in Bengal. The Vallālacharita refers to them as being raised to the status of Sat-Śūdras, and Vallālasena conferred the feudatory title of Mahāmāṇḍalika to Maheśa, the headman of the Kaivartas. Dr. R. C. Majumdar and Dr. Niharranjan Ray have pointed out that the raising of the status of the Kaivartas was due to their hostilities to the Pāla monarch. The correctness of these views can be corroborated by the fact of their revolt during the time of Mahīpāla II. The Rāmacharita plainly records that Divyoka was a feudatory chief and after killing Mahīpāla II assumed the sovereignty of Vacendrī. Ultimately, Bhīma was defeated by Rāmapāla. Further, in Bengal at least the Kaivartas were men of learning. The Saduktikarṇāmṛita contains a poem composed by Kevaṭṭa Papipa on the sanctity of the river Ganges.<sup>257</sup>

The position of weavers seems to have been improved in the Sena times. According to the findings of Dr. Sukumar Sen and Dr. Niharranjan Ray<sup>258</sup>, Dhoyī, who belonged to the community of weavers, rose to the position of a court-poet of King Lakṣmaṇasena. But Mm. Haraprasad Sastri held that Dhoyī was a Rāḍhīya Brāhmaṇa of Pāladhī gāmi. A Vaidya genealogical work claims Dhoyī as a Vaidya. Sri Chintaharan Chakravarti observes that "the question concerning the caste of Dhoyī must remain open until some new and definite information about it is brought to light."<sup>259</sup>

*Hāḍi, Domba, Chaṇḍāla and Badhatau :*

The Hāḍi, Domba (Doma), Chaṇḍāla\* and Badhatau occupied the lowest rank in the social hierarchy. According

\* According to the dharmasāstras, Chaṇḍālas were either offspring of a Śūdra male and a Brāhmaṇa female, or offsprings of an unmarried woman. They lived in houses outside the village, kept a cymbal under their armpit and their avocations were to execute offenders and remove dirt of the villages (Kane: HDS, Vol. II, pt. 1, p. 81)

to Alberuni, they were occupied with dirty work, like the cleansing of the villages and other services and were "not reckoned amongst any caste or guild." He saw the Doma, who played on lute and sang, following the occupation of inflicting corporal punishment on criminals or practised killing as a trade. The Badhatau or executioners were the worst of the untouchables, who devoured flesh of dead animals including dogs. A similar description of the *Chaṇḍālas* is given by Gardīzī, the author of *Kitāb Zainu'l Akhbār*. But Gardīzī makes a distinction between the *Chaṇḍālas* and *Dānians*, who lived like the former. These two communities however did not intermarry (amongst themselves.<sup>261</sup>) A perusal of the *Purāṇas* and digests show that there was not much of distinction amongst these low castes. *Agni Purāṇa*<sup>262</sup> prescribes execution of criminals by *Chaṇḍālas*. *Medhātithi*<sup>263</sup> assigns a similar business to *Svapākas*. Beginning from the days of Yājñavalkya (I.197) till the end of the thirteenth century A.D. there was no change in the strict rules regarding the untouchability of the *Chaṇḍālas*. Some of the writers of digests went to the length of recommending penances for the higher castes for seeing or conversing and even crossing the shadows of untouchables. Kalhaṇa records that Suyya, the great engineer of the times of Avantivarman (855-883 A.D.), was found in a heap of dust on the road by a *Chaṇḍāla* woman Suyya by name, but she "without defiling the child by her touch," arranged for keeping the boy in the house of a *Śūdra* nurse.<sup>265</sup> In Kashmir *Chaṇḍālas* worked as watchmen and guards of houses, as drummers and as executioners. *Ḍombas* worked as singers and huntsmen. Even the Jaina writer Hemachandra requires that the *Chaṇḍālas* and *Ḍombas* should make sounds of sticks, so that the men of the higher castes may be aware of their presence and avoid the pollution.<sup>266</sup> Gardīzī also refers to such practices.<sup>267</sup>

Glimpses of the life of the Bengal *Ḍombas* can be found in the *Charyāpadas*. They lived in the outskirts of the city and were untouchables for the *Brāhmaṇas*. They often rowed

across the rivers<sup>268</sup> and sold baskets and other articles prepared from bamboos in different parts of the country.<sup>269</sup> They were also experts in dancing as many of the Charyāpadas refer to the skilful Dombi dancers.

*Aboriginal tribes and heretical sects :*

Along with these *Chaṇḍālas* there were other untouchables, who belonged to the aboriginal tribes like Bhillas, Śabaras, Andhras, Khasas, Kulikas etc. The Charyāpadas and the Kathāsaritsāgara acquaint us with the manner of life led by aboriginal tribes like Śabaras and Bhillas. Śabara men wore tiger-skins and adorned their bodies with peacock-feathers. Women were also dressed in peacock feathers and wore necklaces of strings of the *guñjā* fruit. Two songs composed by Śabara-pāda draw a vivid picture of them. One song tells us that far off from human habitation dwelt the Śabaras, clad in feathers of peacocks and decked with *guñjā* fruits and ear-rings. Drinking of wine made the male Śabara forget his female partner and hence the Śabarī had to bring her husband back home. Betel leaves and camphor added to their conjugal love. The Śabara lived on hunting and went to far off places in search of quarry. The Śabarī had to take great pains in order to find out her husband.<sup>270</sup> Other songs depict their domestic life. With the ripening of the Chinā (*Kāgaṇi*) paddy begin the festivals of the Sabara community. Vultures and jackals moved frequently and as they destroyed the ripe corn, the Śabaras saved the corn by raising fencing of bamboos.<sup>271</sup> The Bodhisattvādānakalpalatā further tells us of their sacrifice of human beings, and sometimes even their own children before their goddess, Chaṇḍikā or Durgā.<sup>272</sup>

Almost a similar and picturesque and nomadic life was led by the snake-charmers. Sarvānanda (1160 A.D.) found the Bediās showing the snake-plays. Umāpatidhara gives a beautiful description of such performance in these lines : "Brother of the forest, these snakes are small in size ; they are bending their heads on hearing the spells uttered by you.

This hooded snake is perhaps old, because it does not bend its head even when a qualified person like you crawls on the earth."<sup>273</sup>

During the period under survey the society did not rigidly observe the rules laid down by the lawgivers. The Brāhmaṇas gave up the ancient ideal of plain and simple life. Some of them in Bengal, the Uttar Pradesh and the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas accumulated plenty of wealth. In the U. P. and Kashmir they attained the position of feudatory chiefs with the status of *Thakkura*. At times we find them doing the work of a sculptor which the dharmaśāstras assigned to the Śūdras.<sup>274</sup> Some of the Kṣatriyas, took to agriculture. The Kāyasthas, as a caste, were not mere scribes. They became governors of fortresses, ministers and attained the status of *Thakkura* chiefs. Further as in the period between 600 and 1000 A.D.<sup>275</sup> the foreign races excepting the Muslims, were thoroughly absorbed in the Hindu social system. Inscriptions show that the men of the higher castes did not protest against the accession of Yaśaḥ Karṇa, who was begotten by his father Karṇa on Queen Avalladevi of the Hūṇa stock (Huṇanvaya)<sup>276</sup> The Hūṇas were sometimes employed as scribes. Bhāskara, the grandson of the learned Govinda, born in the family of Hūṇa princes, wrote the Ajmer stone-inscription, which contains portions of the Harakelināṭaka in VS 1210/1153 A. D. Govinda was also a favourite of King Bhoja.<sup>277</sup> The people of the kingdom of the Chaulukyas of Anahillapāṭaka also took the Prāgvāṭa, Osavala, Śrīmāla, Dharkkata who, were possibly Śakas or Gurjjaras.<sup>278</sup> into their social fold.

Ramifications in the caste system continued. In Bengal the distinction between the Sat and Asat-Śūdras became more pronounced. The period also indicated formation of 'regional' sub-castes not only among the Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas but also amongst the Jains. Of course, the Jaina *jñātis* in the Chaulukya kingdom were not "endogamous groups, as marriages between Prāgvāṭas, Moḍhas, Oisavālas are recorded."<sup>279</sup> Inscriptions and literature reveal some new

castes, hitherto unknown, namely, Odds, who excavated the Sahasralinga tank in the reign of the Chaulukya king Jayasimha,<sup>280</sup> and Gallaka, who by profession was a merchant.<sup>281</sup>

Prof. Habib holds that on the eve of the Turko-Afghan invasions, "in India the doors of knowledge were closed to all persons not belonging to the twice-born castes."<sup>282</sup> But we have already seen how the Gauḍa, Śrīvāstavas and Vallabha Kāyasthas, physicians and Kaivartas were well-versed in the Sanskrit language and familiar with many other branches of learning. Caste system did not invariably prove a hindrance to the personal achievements of the individual.

### *References to Chapter III (Castes and Professions)*

- 1 Mitākṣarū on Yāj. III. 30 and Aparārka p. 922
- 2 Kane: HDS II, Ch. IV p. 170
- 3 Aparārka pp. 1177-79
- 4 Sachau I. p. 100
- 5 RT VIII 2407 and Kullūka on Manu X. 31
- 6 Brihaddharma Purāṇa II. 13-14.
- 7 Brahmaparivarta Purāṇa (ed. Jivananda Vidyasagar) I. 10. 122
- 8 Kṛtyakalpataru Dānakāṇḍam (GOS) p. 26-30 quoting Yama. Yājñavalkya, Vaśiṣṭha, Mahābhārata and Śātātapa.
- 9 Grihastha pp. 171-179
- 10 Sirpur stone-inscr. EI. XI. 192-193
- 11 IB. III. 181 and Sadukti. I. 34.5 ; 54.1 ; 148.1 ; II. 68.5 ; 151.4 and IV. 21.5 ; 3.5
- 12 HB. I. 580-583
- 13 EI. XIX. 117-124
- 14 EI. II. 330
- 15 Ibid. XXI. 219, line 44-45
- 16 Ibid. V. 114
- 17 RT. VIII. 2444
- 18 EI. IX. 279
- 19 Nadol inscr. dated VS 1198/1141 A.D. (EI. XI. 38) and Bhinmal inscr. dated VS. 1306 (EI. X. 57)
- 20 Palanpur pl. of Bhīma I dated 1064 A.D. (EI. XXI. 173)
- 21 Cp. of Bhīma I dated 1022 A.D. (HIG II. 140)
- 22 DV. VI. 9
- 23 Cp. of Bhīma II dated VS. 1256
- 24 Cp. of Bhīma II dated VS. 1266 (HIG. II. 162)



- 25 Abugiri Jaina inscr. No. 2 dated VS. 1287 (HIG. II. No. 168)
- 26 Cp. of Visaladeva, dated VS. 1317 (HIG. III. No. 216, line 18)
- 27 Journal University of Bombay Vol. XVIII (NS) pt. IV. (Jan. 1950) Pp. 35-41.
- 28 BG. I. pt. II. p. 463-64
- 29 Ibid. p. 464
- 30 JASB 1909, p. 167
- 31 History of Rajputana I. p. 369-388; History of Med. India II. p. 330-333; IHQ. XXVI (1950) pp. 264-273
- 32 Verse 5 of Deopara inscr. (IB III. pp. 46 50-51); V. 5 of Chatsu inscr. (EI. XII. 10ff) and Pingalasūtravṛtti ed. Pt. Kedar Nath p. 49.
- 33 Bhandarkar's definition in IA. 1911. p. 35 accepted in IB. III. p. 44 and f.n.3. Cf. HB. I. 207 and Bāṅgālir Itihāsa Pp. 261, 265, 290
- 34 Kane: HDS II. pt. I. p. 131-132
- 35 Dānakūṇḍam p. 30-31
- 36 Dānasāgara (ed. BI) p. 18-19
- 37 Dānaratnākara, quoted in Dānakūṇḍam Intro. p. 90
- 38 Grihasṭha p. 415
- 39 RT. VII. 108-109
- 40 Ibid. VII. 277-278
- 41 Ibid. VII. 295-297
- 42 Kathāsaritsāgara (Tr. Tawney) Vol. I. p. 306
- 43 Ibid. Vol. II. p. 202
- 44 Ibid. Vol. I. p. 241
- 45 Rājadharmā p. 176
- 46 DHNI. I. Pp. 516-18, 521, 524-25 and 536
- 47 Ibid. I. p. 512
- 48 IB. III. 63 and 67
- 49 RLARBP. p. 329
- 50 Cf. Kauṭilya IX. 2
- 51 Āpastamba I. 10, 29. 7
- 52 Śukranītisāra (ed. Sarkar) IV. 7.599.
- 53 IB. III. p. 33, verse 12
- 54 Ibid. p. 37
- 55 RT. VII. 1450 and VIII. 1013, 1071
- 56 *Senāpati* Kīlhana and his son *Senāpati* Ajayapāla in *Semra* pl. (EI. IV. 158) and *Senāpati* Madanapālaśarman in *Ichhawar* pl. (IA. XXV. 205 ff) under Chandella Paramardi; *Nāgamaiyya* in *Valipattana* pl. (IHQ. 1928, p. 35, lines 44-45) under Raṭṭaraja of the Śilāhāra dynasty; Rāka led the army of King Aṇa of Sapādalakṣa (DV. XVI)
- 57 Prabodhachandrodaya (ed. N. S. Press) I. 3 and I. 6-7
- 58 Kane: HDS Vol. II, Ch. III. pp. 124-126
- 59 Grihasṭha. p. 194
- 60 Grihasṭha. p. 194-195, Cf. Grihasṭharatnākara Pp. 430-431
- 61 Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal.) IV. 3. 19.

62 HIG, III. 200

63 Yāj. III. 40-42

64 Forbidden goods for trade were—fragrant things, fluids, cooked food, sesame, hemp, kṣauma, deerskin, dyed and cleanly washed clothes, milk and its products, roots, flowers, fruits, herbs, honey, meat, grass, water, animals for being killed, slaves, barren cows, heifers and cows liable to abortion, land, rice, yava, goats, sheep, etc. (Gautama VII. 8-15, Vas. Dh. S. II. 27); weapons, sticky things like lac, young stalks (tokma), fermented liquids, sesame and rice (Apastamba Dh. S. I. 7. 20. 11-13, Baudh, Dh. S. II. 1. 77-78, and Laghu Śātātapa verse 87); stones, salt, silk, iron, tin, lead, animals (Vas. Dh. S. II. 24-29 and Yāj. III. 40).

65 Grihasṭha pp. 199-212

66 Sachau II. 132.

67 EI. I. p. 184, 472

68 Grihasṭha Pp. 214-21, 222-23

69 RT. VIII. 108. IB. III. 32ff.; IHQ. XVI. p. 571, Lakṣmidhara etc.

70 RT. VII. 108

71 Sitabaldi S.I. dated 1087 A.D. in EI. II. 306

72 Bakulasvāmī (Gīrnar inscr. RLARBP. 332)

73 Manoratha in Kamauli pi. (EI. II. 354), Someśvara in Gujarat (EI. I. 31), Mādhava under Chaulukya Bhīma II (EI. XX. 57)

74 RT. VIII. 2383

75 Kane: HDS. II. pt. I. Pp. 138-154 Cf. Grihasṭha p. 397 and Rāj. 91-92, 166-175

76 Brahmachāri p. 190

77 Sachau II. 149

78 Mānasollāsa, GOS, Vol. I. p. 44, verse 166.

79 Ghoshal: Hindu Revenue System p. 138 and Altekar: State and Government in Ancient India p. 195

80 EI. VIII. 211 and JASB. Vol. LXII. (1893) pt. I. No. 1.

81 Inscr. of Dhārāvārṣa dated VS 1220/1163 A.D. in IA LVI (1927) p. 51

82 Sachau II. 162

83 Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra (ed. Thomas) Ch. I. Verse 17

84 Laghvarhannitiśāstra I. 1. 37

85 Sachau II. 162

86 A. Cat. of Palm leaf and Selected Paper Mss. belonging to the Durbar Library, p. XVII. B.

87 Vijñāneśvara on Yaj II. 21: Sm. C. I. 30

88 RT. VII. 1229 and VIII. 1013, 2060

89 Rāj. p. 9-18

90 RT. V. 461-477

91 Ibid. VII. 1385

92 Rājjanitiratnākara Ch. II. p. 10

- 93 IHQ. XVI. 670-72 ; IC. VIII. 327
- 94 EI. II. 440-42 (Devapatan praśasti)
- 95 Ibid. XXVII. Pp. 278, 283 (Koni inscr).
- 96 Man and Baghari inscriptions (DHNI II. 702, 717)
- 97 RT. VII. 400-401
- 98 Ibid. 1008
- 99 Ibid. VIII. 2224
- 100 Ibid. VI. 336-344
- 101 Ibid. VIII. 768-777
- 102 Ibid. VIII. 898
- 103 Ibid. VIII. 908
- 104 Ibid. VIII. 2076
- 105 Ibid. 2737
- 106 Ibid. 2733, 2739
- 107 EI. XI. 40, lines 22-24
- 108 Ibid. XV. 301-315 ; HB. I. 88
- 109 RT. VII. 91
- 110 Vide Basahi, Raiwan, Gagaha, Bangavan, Pali and Kamauli plates.
- 111 Kamauli pl. DHNI I. 523
- 112 RAS. grant, DHNI I. 534
- 113 Dānakāṇḍa p. 28. Dānasāgara Vol. I. p. 18
- 114 Dānakāṇḍa p. 20-21 ; Dānasāgara p. 43, 45
- 115 IB. III. p. 146-147, lines 44-61 (Sāhitya Pariṣat CP.)
- 116 DHNI II. 715 (Icchawar pl)
- 117 IB. III. p. 32 ff
- 118 EI. XIII. p. 283 ff (Silimpur slab inscr.)
- 119 Grihastha. p. 1
- 120 EI. II. p. 17-19 (Tewar inscr).
- 121 EI. II. 306 (Sitabaldi inscr. Jated Śaka 1008)
- 122 Samayamōtrikā (ed. N. S. Press) IV. 109-110 and V. 64
- 123 IHQ. XVI. (1940) p. 571
- 124 Brihaddharma Purāṇa (Vangabasi) Uttarakāṇḍa, Ch. 13, 51-52 and Ch. 14. 66-67
- 125 Brahmaparivarta Purāṇa, Brahmakhaṇḍa ch. 10
- 126 Ghurye, G. S.: Caste and Class in India
- 127 Sūdrakamalakara p. 299
- 128 RT. VIII. 3230 and 3346-47
- 129 IA. XVIII (1889) 136-143
- 130 ASR. XXI. 49. During Madanavarman's reign Rāuta Veda, a Kṣatriya by caste, built something in Jayapuradurga for use of people (Ajaigarh S. I. 1151 A.D.)
- 131 EI. I. 154 ff. Field of Memmūka, son of Kṣatriya Devavarman given to Naba-Durgā.
- 132 Grihastha, p. 252 commenting on Śaṅkhalikhita's use of the word Kṣatatrāṇa, Lakṣmīdhara states Kṣatāt trāṇam 'Kṣatatrāṇam'

- 133 Grihastha p. 253 ; Sachau II, 136
- 134 Grihastha p. 191. quoting Manu X. 83.
- 135 EI. I. 154ff.
- 136 Dānakāṇḍa p. 37
- 137 Dānasāgara (Fasc. I) p. 20-21 quoting also Viṣṇudharmottra (3.300. 3-4)
- 138 IA, XVIII. pp. 136-143
- 139 Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal.) IV. 7. 332-334,
- 140 Sachau II, 162
- 141 Struggle for Empire p. 477
- 142 RT. VII. 1617-1618
- 143 Kathāsaritsāgara (Tr. Tawney) Vol. I. p. 72, 140, 151, etc.
- 144 EI. XII. 57-59 dated VS. 1059/c. 1003 A. D.
- 145 Manu III. 112
- 146 Baudhāyana Dh. S. I. 11. 4
- 147 AR. p. 332-333 and Ghurye, G. S. *Op. cit.* pp. 57, 64, 88, 96
- 148 CC. Prāyaścittakhaṇḍa.
- 149 Grihastha p. 255
- 150 Sachau II, 136
- 151 Ibid. I. 101
- 152 Ibid. II. 136
- 153 Grihastha, p. 258.
- 154 Medhātithi On Manu X. 95.
- 155 Kane: HDS. II. 1. 75-76.
- 156 JUPHS XIX. (1946) p. 81-82
- 157 Writers of legal documents in different parts of Northern India were: In Orissa, Koighoṣa under Mahābhavagupta I (EI. XI. 95), Janamejaya (EI. III. 344), Mangaladatta under Mahābhavagupta II (Ibid III. 357) and Mahuka under Rānaka Malladatta (Ibid III. 347f). In the U. P. Śūraditya under Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla (Ibid. XI. 25-26), Purandara under Jayachandra (IHQ. 1929, p. 40); In the Chamba State, Sekha under Lalitavarman (EI. XX. 198); in the kingdom of the Chandellas Prithvidhara under Paramardideva (IA. XXV. 207); In the Chaulukya kingdom, Jejja under Mūlaraja I (IA. VI. 192-93) Kāñchana (IA. VI. 194, XVIII. 110) Vaṇeśvara under Bhīma I (EI. XXI. 171). Keka under Karna (JBBRAS. 26, 250), Kekkaka (EI. I. 318), Somasirṃha (IA. VI. 200, 202, 204, 209), Vosarina (IA. VI. 195) and Vājaḍa under Bhīma II (RLARBP. 328); in the Paramāra kingdom, Guṇadhara in 949 A.D. (DHNI. II. 849) Sohika in 1047 A.D. (DHNI II. 865), Asarāja in c. 1080 A.D. (Ibid. II. 920).
- 158 IA. XV. 208 ; EI. XX. 130, 136.
- 159 HDS. II. i. p. 76.
- 160 Naiṣadhacharita XIV. 66 (ed. Handiqui).
- 161 EI. XXVIII. 100f.
- 162 Ibid XXV. 276f.
- 163 Ibid. XXIV. 108.

164 Udayasundarikathā (GOS) p. 11 (Kāyastha-nāmno Maheśvara-gaṇasy āvatāraḥ Kṣatriya-vibhuṣaṇam Kulāditya) Cf. HB. I. p. 587 identifying Silāditya with a king of the Maitraka dynasty.

165 Bhāratīya Vidyā, Vol. X. p. 284 Dr. Sircar has given a correct explanation of the word when he states, "An official, who usually sat beside his master in discharging his duties and was often the chief intermediary between his master and the latter's clients or subjects, may have been naturally called Kāyastha in the sense of Kāyastha-iva 'as if staying in the person of his master,' by reason of his influence or intimacy on the master."

166 EI. I. 81.

167 Ibid. XII. 61.

168 IA. XIX. 218.

169 EI. XI. 41.

170 IA. XLI. 203.

171. ABORI. 1941-42 P. 318.

172 EI. I. 122.

173 Ibid. I. 147.

174 Ibid. XXIII. 6, 8.

175 Ibid. XIX. Pp. 209, 213.

176 EI. XXIII. 6. (Pendrabandh pl).

177 DHNI. Vol. II. 718.

178 Bh. List in EI. XX. 64 (Nana inscr. dated VS. 1257).

179 EI. XI. 41.

180 Ibid. I. 211.

181 EI. XXVIII. 100.

182 Benares grant, dated VS. 1171 and Kamauli grant, dated VS. 1172 by Jalhana (EI. VIII: 153, IV. 104), Kamauli grant dated VS. 1182 by Kithana (EI. IV. 101). Sahet Mahet inscr. (IA. XVII. 62)

183 JRAS. 1927. P. 696.

184 ASIR. III. 58.

185 EI. XXVIII. 104, verse 39.

186 EI. I. 39. (Ratanpur inscr.), XXII. 163 (Sarkho pl), IHQ. 1925, p. 411 and EI. XIX. 214 (Amoda pl), EI. I. 45 (Malhar SI).

187 EI. XXIII. 230.

188 Ibid. IV. 103-104.

189 JRAS. 1927. p. 696. (Meohar SI).

190 EI. I. 333 (Jajuka in Ajaigadh RI. dated VS. 1345).

191 EI. XXIII. 230 (Sujana in Sone East Bank CP).

192 Ibid. I. 333-336.

193 Ibid. XXVIII. 103.

194 Ibid. XXIII. 163.

195 JRAS 1927, p. 695-696.

196 Ibid. I. 45-52.

197 Ibid I. 330ff. and XXVIII. 104.

198 IA. XV. 202 (Gwalior inscr. dated VS. 1161) ASIR. 1903-04 pt. II. p. 286 (Gwalior Museum inscr. dated VS. 1350). PRAS. WC, 1905-06, p. 58 (Bijolia inscr), EI. XII. 46 (Battihagadh inscr).

199 EI. XII. 46.

200 Ibid. XI. 57.

201 IA. XV. 202.

202 EI. XIX. 45-52.

203 Ibid. IX. 68; Ibid. IX 63-66; XX. 47.

204 Ibid. XXVI. 99, V. 89.

205 ASIR III 58 (Gadhwa Pl, dated VS 1199).

206 EI. XXI. 158 (Tilakwada pl. dated VS. 1103/1946 A. D.).

207 IA. VI. 56.

208 EI. XXI. 50.

209 Ibid. XVIII. 243.

210 From about the eighth century A. D. the kings informed them about royal grants (EI. IV. 250, EI. XXII. 155, XXVIII 282 II. 309 etc). They composed and wrote the royal charters in the kingdoms of the Guhilas of Chatsu in Rajputana (DHNI, II, 1200), Chandellas (DHNI II. 685, EI. I. 125, DHNI. II. 726), Kalachuris of Tripurī and Ratanpur (EI. XI. 146, line 49, Ibid XXVIII. 6, verse 29), and the Gāhaḍavālas (DHNI. I. 516, 523, 526, EI. IV. 104, 106, 107, 111, ibid, XVIII. 224, 225, XIII. 220, VIII. 100). Some of them even rose to the position of ministers. As early as the Gunaighar grant, we find reference to a Karaṇa-Kāyastha as the Minister of Peace and War (IHQ. VI. p. 55, 58). The father of Sandhyākaranandī also held a similar post (RC. Navipraṣasti, verse 5). During the period under survey the Karaṇikas of the status of *Thakkura* chiefs can be found in the kingdoms of the Chandellas. (Rewa grant in DHNI. II, 726) and the Gāhaḍavālas (Kamauli pl. dated 1116 A.D. (EI IV. 104), dated 1118-19 A.D. (EI. IV. 107), Don Buzurg dated 119-20 A.D. (EI. XVIII 223), Chhatarpur dated 1120 A.D. (EI. XVIII 220), Gagaha dated 1143 A.D. (EI. XIII. 220), Lar pl. dated 1146 A.D. (EI. VII. 100) Banaras, dated 1146 (DHNI I. 526). Contemporary inscriptions reveal two other facts about the Karaṇas. Some of them trained their sons in composing verses or writing the copper-plates. The writing of legal documents became a hereditary profession. The Harsa and Bilhari stone-inscriptions of the tenth-eleventh centuries were composed and written by Dhirunāga and Nāi who were the sons of Karaṇikas Thirūka and Dhīra respectively (EI. II. 124, verse 45 and EI. I. 270). They were not simply following the set pattern in writing out the documents. Jaḍḍha, the writer of the Khajuraho inscription of the year 953-54 A.D. was a *Sanskritabhāṣāvidyas* (DHNI. II. 685). Pratirāja, the writer of the Pendrabandh plate of the Kalachuri king Pratāpamalla, dated KS. 965/1214 A.D. was an ocean of learning (Vidyāmbudhī in EI. XXIII. 6).

211 Bhāratiya Vidyā. Vol. X. p. 281

212 Jalhana is described in one inscription as a Kāyastha (EL. IV. 104) and in another as Karanikodgata (EI. VIII. 153).

213 EI I. 330.

214 Vogel, J. P.: *Antiquities of Chamba State*. Pt. I. Pp. 194, 199.

215 EI. XII. 75.

216 DHNI. II. 1082. Dr. Bhandarkar in his List p. 52 wrongly states that he made a donation.

217 HB. I. 585.

218 Vāṅgālīr Itihāsa p. 319.

219 Age of Imperial Kanauj p. 394 f.n. No. 94.

220 RT. VII. 39.

221 Ibid. VIII. 2383.

222 HB. I. 589-591 Vāṅgālīr Itihāsa Pp. 280-81, 307-308, Dr. D. C. Sircar (JUPHS. XVIII. 148-160) disproves the identity of Vaidyas and Ambasthas and does not believe in the introduction of Kulinism amongst the Vaidyas earlier than the seventeenth century A. D.

223 EI. XVIII. 221 (Don Buzurg pl.) ibid. XXVI. 73 (Kamaul, pl.), ibid. XI. 24 (Sahet Mahet pl.) ibid. XXVI. 272 (Rajghat pl. dated 1140 A. D.), ibid. XXIV. 294 (Lucknow Mus. pl.).

224 EI. XXI. 52 (Arthuna inscr. dated 1109 A.D.).

225 Ibid. IV. 157 (Semra pl.)

226 It is difficult to agree with the view of Dr. Ghoshal that "the description of the Sūdras' occupation and status in the commentaries and digests of this period (1000 to 1300 A.D.) follows the old Smṛiti lines. (Struggle for Empire, p. 475).

227 Grihastha p. 427.

228 Medhātithi on Manu III. 67. 121, 156; X. 127; Viśvarūpa on Yāj. I. 13.

229 Grihastha. p. 271-272.

230 Niyatakūlakāṇḍa p. 356; Grihastharatnākara p. 336.

231 Niyatakūlakāṇḍa p. 262-63.

232 EI. III. 16f., VI. 269. XI. 319f, XXII. 143f. etc.

233 Vaij. 81. 108-111.

234 Brihaddharma Purāṇa. Uttarakāṇḍa. Ch. XIII. 33-48, XIV. 33-65.

235 Brahmaparivarta Purāṇa. I. X. 122; Vijñāneśvara on Yāj. I. 95.

236 Vaij. 82. 121.

237 Brihaddharma Purāṇa, Uttarakh. Ch. XIII. 33-34, 40.

238 EI. XIX. 277ff; XXIII. 141.

239 HB. I. p. 240-241; IHQ. XVI. 702-705.

240 HDS II. pt. I. p. 98.

241 JBORS XXVI. 245 on gift of Keśava in the 31st. Yr. of Mahāpāla.

242 Singhara grant of Ranabhañja dated 9 incised by Vaṇik-Suvaṇṇakāra Padmanābha (DHNI. I. 437), Upalada grant of Rāṇaka Rāmadeva (EI. XXIII. 141), Narasinghapur charter of Uddyotakesari Mahābhavagupta IV. by Suvarṇavithivijñāni Baheru and Maṅgaka (JBORS XVII. 24).

243 EI. IV. 124. 1A. XXV. 205-208, and EI. XVI. 9.

244. DHNI. II. 809 and 904.

245 Ibid. II. 706 (Kalinjar RI).

246 Ibid. II. 708 (Khajuraho Jain images inscr. dated VS 1215/1157 A.D.).

247 HDS. II. pt. I. p. 70-71.

248 Ibid. p. 173.

249 JOHRS I. & 7 (Bhubanesvar Temple inscr.), EI. I. 287ff. (Mathura Praśasti).

250 EI. XIX. 277ff.

251 EI. III. 296 (Kharepatan pl. dated 1008 A. D.).

252 Samayamātrikā (N. S. Press) I. 8.

253 EI. I. 154ff. (Vaillabhattachasvāmin inscr. line 17-20); Ibid. I. 162 ff. (Siyadoni inscr. lines 15-16; Ibid. I. 271 ff. (Cintra Praśasti, verse 65).

254 EI. XI. 47 (Sanderav inscr. dated VS. 1221).

255 EI. I. 154ff. (Vaillabhattachasvāmin inscr. lines 11-17), Ibid. XXIII. 141 (Somnath Temple inscr. dated 1028 A.D.).

256 DHNI. II. 875, JASB (NS) X. 241-43

257 Sadukti. p. 28, I. 36, 5

258 Sen, Sukumar: Prāchin Bāṅgālā p. 19: Ray: Vāṅgālir Itihasa p. 319.

259 Pavanadūtam (ed. Chintaharan Chakravarti) Intro. p. 5

260 Sachau I. 102.

261 Ouseley Ms. from Bodelian Library, Ms. Page No. 248A.

262 Agni Purāṇa Ch. 151. 10f.

263 On Manu X. 38

264 Medhātithi on Manu V. 12, X. 51: Aparārka on Yāj. III. 292; Sm. C. II. 304-308; Prāyaścittaprakaraṇa 111-114; Kṛityakalpātaru-śuddhikāṇḍa (GOS) p. 127, 176 etc.

265 RT. V. 74-77

266 Deśināmamālā II. 73, III. 54 dumbūdinīm sparśaparihārārtha chihṇayaṣṭih; chaṇḍālādinām sparśa parihārārtha chihṇayaṣṭih.

267 Ms. Ouseley, MS. Page No. 248A.

268 Bauddha Gāna O Dohā and Charyāgiti Padāvalī Pada Nos. 8, 14.

269 Ibid. Pada No. 10

270 Bauddha Gāna O Dohā and Charyāgiti Padāvalī, Pada No. 28.

271 Ibid. Pada No. 50



- 272 Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā (ed. Ray) P. 707, Ch. 84, 37  
 273 Sadukti, P. 243, IV. 25, 5.  
 274 Vaikhānasa Smārta-Śūtra X. 14 (ed. Caland).  
 275 Age of Imperial Kanauj p. 373.  
 276 EI. II. 4 verse 15; XII. 212, verse 15; JASB. XII. 480 verse  
 13  
 277 DHNI. II. 1076  
 278 Sankalia: Studies in Historical and Cultural Geography of  
 Gujarat Pp. 140, 143-145.  
 279 Sankalia: Op. cit. p. 156.  
 280 Forbes: Rās Mālā (ed. Rawlinson) p. 110.  
 281 EI. III. 304 (Verawal image inscr. line 2, dated 1246 A.D.)  
 282 HIED II (ed. Aligarh) Intro, Pp. 39, 41.

## CHAPTER IV

### **The Turkish settlers and effects of social contact with them.**

The age-long tradition of Indian society was to allow foreigners to settle down in this country and to permit them to follow their respective avocations without any hindrance. There was a special department in the Maurya capital to take care of foreigners. The foreign elements in the Indian population responded to the kindness and hospitality of the people of the country and in course of time they became assimilated to the Indian social structure. The Governments and the people of different states of Northern India did not deviate from their traditional habit of tolerating the foreigners even after the ruthless invasion of Sultān Mahmūd. Alberuni, of course, records that "Mahmūd utterly ruined the prosperity of the country, and performed wonderful exploits, by which the Hindus became like atoms of dust scattered in all directions, and like a tale of old in the mouth of the people. Their scattered remains cherish, of course, the most inveterate aversion to all Muslims".<sup>1</sup> This aversion manifested itself in matters of social contact with the Muslims indeed, but, it was not strong enough to impel them to prohibit the settlement of isolated groups of Turko-Afghans in different parts of the country.

Ibn Asir records that a large number of Muslims settled in the areas round Banaras since the time of Sultān Sabuktigīn. The historian makes the definite statement that "there were Mussalmans in that country since the days of Mahmud bin Sabuktigīn, who continued faithful to the law of Islam and constant in prayer and good works."<sup>2</sup> This is partially corroborated by the tradition which the sixteenth century Lama historian Tāranātha records. He refers to the settlements of Turks in the Antardvedi or the Ganges-Jamuna doāb.<sup>3</sup> He

further states that during the time of Lavasena and his successors, the Turks increased in number in Magadha, prior to the invasion of Odantapurī and Vikramaśīla.<sup>4</sup> We get another corroborative evidence from the traditional history of Maner, in the district of Patna, according to which there were Turkish settlers at Maner.<sup>5</sup> An inscription found at Maner and dated VS 1183/1124 A.D. records the gift of the village Padali in the *pattalā* of Maniari, which is modern Maner, to a Brāhmaṇa by King Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla who orders his officers: "obedient to my command, you shall give all dues as given now including the revenue, the trade duties and the *Turuṣkadaṇḍa*".<sup>6</sup> The term *turuṣkadaṇḍa* has been interpreted variously as a counterpart of Danegold offered to the Turks to induce them not to invade the country or as a tax collected for the purpose of collecting the funds for bearing the expenses of defending the country against the Turks. But in view of the fact that the Turks were allowed to settle down in some part of the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom, it was quite natural on the part of the Government to levy a special punitive tax from such settlers.\*

\*Dr. D. C. Ganguly, however, prefers to interpret *turuṣkadaṇḍa* as "Some suggest that it was an impost on the subjects of the Gāhaḍavālas to meet the expenses of resisting the invasion of the Muslims. Others think that the Gāhaḍavāla kings realised this tax from the people in order to make annual payment of tribute to the Sultāns of Ghaznī..... It was probably to enforce the regular payment of this tribute that the Muslims led expeditions against Northern India from time to time." (Struggle for Empire, p. 51) He identifies Chānd Rāi who helped Mahmūd with Chandradeva, the second known king of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty. This Mahmūd is the son of Sultan Ibrahim of Ghazni and Governor of the Punjab and he plundered Kanauj and Kālinjar and invaded Ujjain. There is, however, no positive evidence to show that the Gāhaḍavālas ever acknowledged the suzerainty of the Ghaznavide Sultāns. As a matter of fact, we find that Govindachandra and his son Vijayachandra repulsed the attacks of the Mussalmans. Of course, the Muslim chroniclers claim that Ala-ud-daulah Masūd III defeated Malhi, king of Kanauj and released him on payment of a large sum of money. If Malhi is identified with Madanachandra, whose son Govindachandra,

It was common sense prudence on the part of the Gāhādavāla Government to maintain some kind of register for Turkī settlers and to impose a special tax upon them, because their compatriots were in the habit of attacking Northern India from time to time. Thus we find that between 1086 and 1114 A.D., there were the invasions of Mahmūd, his son Sultan Ibrāhīm of Ghaznī and of Ala-ud-daulah Masūd III. Again between 1133 and 1169 A.D. there were three other invasions. The earliest of these was repulsed by Arṇorāja,<sup>7</sup> the second by his son Vighararāja IV alias Viśaladeva, who claims to have "once more made Aryavarta what its name signifies by repeatedly exterminating the Mlechchhas (who had rendered the name meaningless by their occupation of the country)".<sup>8</sup> The third invasion was probably led by Khusrav Malik, who was defeated by Vijayachandra, son of Govindachandra Gāhādavāla.<sup>9</sup> None but the Hindu princes would have allowed some members of the invading community to reside as freely in some parts of their domains. It cannot be said that they were forced to permit them the right of residence in their states because, concession of such a right is not recorded even by the Muslim chroniclers of old. It speaks highly also of the spirit of tolerance of the masses of Northern India that they did not make the life of Turkish settlers miserable.

On the other hand, the history of the Chaulukyas of Gujarat furnishes several glorious examples of the active support which the princes and the people of Gujarat extended to the Muslim population. Dr. A. K. Majumdar has rightly pointed out that within three decades of the devastating invasion of Somnatha, the people of Gujarat allowed the

as a prince, claims to have fought and defeated the Turks, there is no reason why we should reject the Indian claim in favour of the claim of the Turks. Moreover, even the Turkī claim does not go so far as payment of tributes regularly at stated intervals by the Gāhādavālas. Had a tax been levied specifically to pay the tribute to the Turks, why should there be fresh attacks again and again?

Muslims to build up a mosque at Ahmedabad in 1053 A.D.<sup>10</sup> He further draws upon Muhammad 'Ufi to show how Siddharāja, on hearing of the burning of a mosque and the killing of eighty Muslims at Cambay, himself hurried to the place of occurrence in disguise, punished the offenders and gave the Muslims one lac of *Balotras* to rebuild their mosque.<sup>11</sup> The merchants of Gujarat too made handsome contributions for the purpose of constructing a mosque for the use of the Muslims.<sup>12</sup>

This sort of broadminded tolerance for the religion of the foreign settlers was not to be found in the history of mediæval Europe. Alberuni mistook the insistence of the Brāhmaṇas on their habit of maintaining ceremonial purity as their narrowness and fanaticism, and wrote: "All their fanaticism is directed against those who do not belong to them, against all foreigners. They call them *mlechchha* i.e. impure and forbid having any connection with them, be it by inter-marriage, or any other kind of relationship, or by sitting, eating and drinking with them, because thereby, they think they would be polluted. They consider as impure anything which touches the fire, and the water of a foreigner."<sup>13</sup> The Kashmirian King Kalāśa (1063-1089 A.D.) employed Turkish architect to erect a golden parasol over the temple of Kalāśeśvara. Another King of the same state, Harṣa employed the Turks in his army.<sup>14</sup>

The Sūfī saints who came to India during the period under review tried to bring the two communities closer to each other. Prof. Askari has shown that a number of Sūfī saints like Sālār Masūd, Syed Hussain Khingsawar, Syed Ahmed, Syed Mohammad Momin Arif, Israil, Abdul Aziz and Ismail settled in Bharaich, Ajmer, Jarua (modern Hajipur) and other parts of North and South Bihar.<sup>15</sup> The celebrated Sūfī saints Khwaja Muinuddin Chisti arrived in India in 1190 A.D. and made Ajmer the chief centre of his activity. There were other Sūfī and Ismaili saints like Abdullā (1065 A.D.) Nuruddin and Muhammad Ali (died 1137 A.D.) in Gujarat and

Sayyad Shāh Surkū Khal Datian at Netrokona in the district of Mymensingh<sup>16</sup> (now in East Pakistan).

The Sūfī saints did not like to have any connection with the Muslim kings, governors and generals. One of the early Sūfī saints of the Chisti order, Khwaja Fariduddin Masūd Ganjshakar (died 1265 A.D.) addressed his disciple Sayyidi Maulā thus: "Do not make friends with kings and nobles. Consider their visits to your home as fatal (for your spirit)."<sup>17</sup> The Sūfī saints tried to pick up the language of the people and some of them are known to have conversed with them in *Khariboli*. They evinced their partiality for Indian music, used betel leaves, used the Indian palanquin for conveyance and manifested a liberal outlook in their dealings with Indians.<sup>18</sup>

The Sūfī saints adopted also some of the religious practices and beliefs of the Hindus and Buddhists. Prof. Askari thinks that in the practices of the Sūfī saints in Bihar like carrying a begging bowl, use of rosary, control of breath or *prāṇāyāma*, one can discern the influence of Hindu and Buddhist ideas. Moreover, the Sūfis came to believe in the seven worlds (Awalim-i-Sabaa) and Yoga and also in *samādhi*, which they called Muraqaba. "Sufistic Islam", observes Prof. Askari, "does not emphasize the transcendental ideals of orthodox Islam, and the absolute separation of the creation from the created but inclines towards the Hindu belief aiming at union with the created by merging the individuality with the Divine Essence or the tenets of Buddhism about the gradual perfection of the individuals or their growth by stages until they attain the state of beatitude."<sup>19</sup> All these could not but draw certain sections of the Hindu community towards them.

It is, however, extremely difficult to ascertain the exact amount of influence which the Muslims exercised in the period prior to 1194 A.D. Some writers have gone to the length of saying that some of the lower castes, who were denied some of the ordinary rights of citizenship welcomed the message of equality preached by Islam and readily became

converted. But history or tradition records very few cases of such conversion. According to one tradition, one Rāmdeo, who was said to have been the chief priest of Ajmer, was asked by Pṛthvirāja III to expel the Sūfi saint, refused to do so and subsequently became a disciple of Khwaja Muinuddīn Chisti.<sup>20</sup>

Another instance of conversion on a considerable scale is to be found in the eleventh century A.D., when some members of the depressed castes, like Kanbis, Kharwars and Koris were converted to Islam by Nuruddīn Nur Satagar of the Ismaili sect.<sup>21</sup>

Beef-eating was not unknown even amongst the Brāhmaṇas in ancient India.<sup>22</sup> In the fourteenth century, Chaṇḍeśvara quotes Devala to show that flesh of cows is forbidden.<sup>23</sup> But in the twelfth century Aparārka quotes Śaṅkha in support of the views that the flesh of buffaloes was allowable.<sup>24</sup> Śukranītisāra refers to the custom of beef-eating among artisans of mid-India.<sup>25</sup> Yaśastilakachampū speaks of the Rahamānas as eaters of beef.<sup>26</sup> From this Handiqui infers that they were Mussalmans. But Abul Faraj (A.D. 988), an Arab traveller, regards them as a sect of the Hindus, though he calls them Rahmar(n)iyya.<sup>27</sup> It is, therefore, not possible to consider the Rahamānas as a section of Hindus, converted to Islam. Their name, according to Nainar, was a corrupt form of the word *Rājānumaraṇīya*, which means those who follow their king to death.

The one important effect which can be ascribed to the contact with the Arabs and Turks is probably an incentive to write history and historical poems. Before the ninth century A.D., we get only one instance of semi-historical literature, namely the *Harṣacharita* by Bāṇabhaṭṭa. But the eleventh and twelfth centuries are exceptionally rich in this field. We find eminent scholars like Śaṅkuka, Kalhaṇa, Sandhyākaranandī, Hemachandra and Jayānaka, taking up the task of writing the history of their respective regions or periods.

Some scholars<sup>28</sup> think that words like 'Sāhi' and Hammīra

were adopted by the Hindus as a result of their contact with the Mussalmans. The earliest use of the title *Sāhī* by kings is as late as V.S. 1346/1289 A.D. by Hammīravarman, the Chandella king.<sup>29</sup> But the use of the word *Hammīra* or *Hamvīra*, in inscriptions and Sanskrit literature meant the Muslims till the end of the twelfth century.<sup>30</sup>

The Hindus influenced the Muslim kings and people in a number of ways. Dr. S. K. Chakraborty has shown how the kings like Sultān Mahmūd, Muhammad bin Sam of Ghūr and Iltutmish, were constrained to use the Hindu weight system, types and legends, and even the honorific (word), *Śree*, on their coins.<sup>31</sup> The common Muslims of the times of Amir Khusrav (1255-1325) began not only appreciating the Indian music but also using *pān* or betel leaves. Dr. Yusuf Husain also finds a good deal of influence of Śivarātri and Rathayātrā or car festival and the celebration of Kṛṣṇalīlā in the Muslim festivals like Shabebarat and the taklīs out of Ta'ziyas on the occasion of Mohurram in India.<sup>32</sup>

### *Śuddhi*

Turkish invaders often carried a large number of Hindus as slaves to their country. Many of these slaves were also kept in that portion of the Punjab, which fell to the hands of the Turks. Some of them must have succeeded in their attempt to escape to India. Were these people taken back into the fold of Hindu society? Devala-smṛti classifies such people broadly into two categories—those who had been forced to kill cows, eat the leavings of the food of the *Mlechchhas* and cohabit with their women, and those who had not done any of the forbidden things. The former could be re-converted upto the period of less than four years and the latter “who had stayed with Mlechchhas from five to twenty years is purified by undergoing two Chāndrāyaṇas”.<sup>33</sup> It has been usually held that the Hindu society became more conservative in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and refused to re-admit anybody who had been contaminated by his con-



tact with the Mlechchhas. But we have positive evidence to show that even in the fourteenth century such re-admission was possible. Vidyāranya, who was a contemporary of Vedāntadeśika (1269-1370), in his Pañchadaśī uses the following simile: "Just as a Brāhmaṇa seized by Mlechchhas and afterwards undergoing the appropriate *prāyaścitta* does not become confounded with the Mlechchhas (but returns to his original status of being a Brāhmaṇa), so the Intelligent Soul is not really to be confounded with the body and other material adjuncts."<sup>34</sup>

As regards abducted women, Devala writes (Devala-smṛti 88-89) that if a Brāhmaṇa woman happens to feed a Mlechchha, or to eat proscribed articles of food, she would attain purity if she observes a *parāka* penance. A quarter less is prescribed for the female members of the remaining *varṇas* in descending order of the social grade. If there were no physical relation, nor any proscribed food eaten, or even if she had taken food belonging to a Mlechchha, she would obtain purity at the lapse of three nights (of the menstrual period). Devala was liberal enough to say that, "the womenfolk of the four orders as well as those of other castes, who happen to become pregnant as a direct consequence of coming in contact with Mlechchhas, or who happen to eat the proscribed dishes willingly or unwillingly, would become pure, by observing a *Kṛchhra sātāpana* penance and by cleansing the private parts with clarified butter. The child born of such unions should be given away to others and must be retained. The caste fellows too should reject such children for fear of causing a mixture of castes."<sup>35</sup>

We do not know whether such liberal views were prevalent even in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. But Lakṣmīdhara, at least, was broadminded enough to exonerate the unfortunate women who were forcibly abducted. He quotes with approval the view of Yama to the effect that a woman does not become impure if she is taken by force and if she is enjoyed by the abductor.<sup>36</sup> The Brahmapaivarta

Purāṇa, which was possibly written in Bengal during the period under survey, shows equally liberal views. It states that an unwilling woman who has been ravished by a robust fellow cannot be blamed.<sup>37</sup> The Purāṇa further observes: "An unwilling woman must not be blamed, she would attain purity if she observes penances. But if she be a willing party, she should be disowned."<sup>38</sup>

#### REFERENCES TO CHAPTER IV

(*The Turkish Settlers and Effects of Social Contact with them*)

1. Sachau I. 22-23.
2. HIED, Vol II. p. 251.
3. IA. IV. (1875) p. 366.
4. IHQ XXII (1951) p. 240.
5. AIOC 6th Session, Patna, pp. 123 ff.
6. JBORS II Pt. IV. p. 444 Text p. 346.
7. Struggle for Empire p. 82.
8. IA XIX. 219.
9. EI. IV. 119; Struggle for Empire p. 54.
10. PIHC 1939 (Calcutta Session) p. 647; Majumdar, A. K. Chaulukyas of Gujrat p. 332.
11. Majumdar, A. K. : *Op. cit.* p. 331; HIED Vol. II. p. 163-164.
12. *Ibid* p. 331; Jagadūcharita VI. 64.
13. Sachau I. 19-20.
14. RT VII 528-29, 1149.
15. Historical Miscellany p. 53ff.
16. IC Vol. I. p. 205ff; Arnold: Preachings of Islam p. 275; Titus: Indian Islam p. 43.
17. Barani's Tarikh-i-Firoz Shāhi quoted in Y. Husain's Mediaeval Indian Culture p. 39.
18. S. H. Askari's article on Islamic Mysticism in Historical Miscellany pp. 61-69; Mediaeval Indian Culture p. 46.
19. Historical Miscellany p. 51.
20. Siyaru'l Auliā quoted in Mediaeval Indian Culture p. 37.
21. Arnold: *Op. cit.* p. 275; Titus : *Op. cit.* p. 43.
22. HDS Vol. II, pp. 772-781.
23. Grihastharatnākara p. 375.
24. Aparārka p. 1167.
25. Śukranītisāra (ed. Sarkar) IV. 95-96; (ed. Calcutta) IV. 5. 49.
26. Yaśastilakachampū (ed. N. S. Press) VII. 24.
27. Nainar, SMH: Arab Geographers' Knowledge of Southern India p. 128.

28. Dikshit, R. K. in JUPHS. Vol. XXIII p. 235.
29. Charkhari pl. EI. XX. 135.
30. Hansi inscr. IA 1912, p. 18 ; Mahoba inscr. FI. I. 221, verse 17 ; RĪ. VII. 53, 64 ; Hammīramada-mardana of Jayasirṃha Suri ; Hammira-mahākāvya of Nayachandra ; Cf. Śrīdhara's Devapattan Praśasti dated 1216 A. D. EI. II. 445, verse 43.
31. PIHC Vol. III (Calcutta Session, 1939) pp. 675-84 ; JUPHS XVII (1944) pp. 45-54.
32. Husain, Y ; Mediaeval Indian Culture p. 125.
33. Devala verses 53-55 ; Kane ; HDS Vol. II. 390-91.
34. Kane ; HDS Vol II. p. 391.
35. Translation of Devala, verses 47-52 by Manmatha Nath Ray in JBORS 1927, pp. 166-167.
36. Śuddhikāṇḍa in Krityakalpataru, p. 179.
37. Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa II. 58. 109.
38. *Ibid.* IV. 47. 40.

## CHAPTER V

### Position of Women in Society

#### *Women as dependents:*

The Smṛti commentaries and digests of the period under survey give us the impression that women had no independent legal status. The theory of perpetual tutelage affected their personal status. They were to remain chaste not only in their conduct but also in their thought. Women, the Śukranīṣāra<sup>1</sup>, lays down, are to assist in the function of the males and also in agriculture and store-keeping. It was because of their dependent position that the law-givers and digest-writers ordained that the superseded and adulterous wives were to be maintained by their husbands.<sup>2</sup> Both Lakṣmīdhara and Vijñāneśvara<sup>3</sup> recommend that a superseded wife should receive from her husband a sum equal to the expenses of her marriage or as much as the new wife receives as a wedding gift. A woman could not dispose of her husband's property.<sup>4</sup> She was never to be called to Court for giving evidence except in matters relating to women.

#### *Respect for Women:*

Women continued to be respected as in ancient India.<sup>5</sup> An ancient Indian sage declared "strike not with a blossom a woman guilty of a hundred faults". Śukra states that women should be addressed as sister and *subhagā*<sup>6</sup>. The highest respect was shown for the mother.<sup>7</sup> Kṣemendra<sup>8</sup> tells us that the mother's position was superior to that of *gurus*. She was not to be disobeyed even on a single occasion.<sup>9</sup> It is interesting to note here that quoting Baudhāyana and Gautama, Lakṣmīdhara recommends that a son should abandon the father who kills the King, who teaches the Śūdra, who accepts money, from Śūdras, for performing his own sacrifices or sacrifices on behalf of Śūdras, who is guilty of killing embryos, who

lives with the lowest classes or who cohabits with a female of the low caste, but never the mother even when she is excommunicated.<sup>10</sup> Chāṇḍeśvara<sup>11</sup>, however, omits the dicta of Gautama and Baudhāyana, and holds the view that both the parents are to be obeyed and served, even if they become outcastes.

The position of women improved considerably during the tenth and twelfth centuries A.D. Dr. Ghoshal and Dr. R. C. Majumdar after discussing the views of the Smṛtichandrikā, Vijñāneśvara, Dhāreśvara and Viśvarūpa, arrives at the conclusion that "a distinct improvement of their status is observable in respect of their rights of property".<sup>12</sup> We find corroboration of this view from the writings of Jimūtavāhana, who lays down that a widow has the right to inherit her husband's entire property in the absence of any male issue.<sup>13</sup> Dr. Asoke Majumdar has shown that the two documents in the Lekhāpaddhati called Vibhaṅgapatravidhi dated V.S. 1288 declare the right of a widow to a share, which is equal to that enjoyed by the son and that the successors are liable to contribute equally for the marriage expenses of the unmarried sister.<sup>14</sup> In this connection it is necessary to note the observations of Alberuni. He states: "the chief rule of their law of inheritance is this, that the women do not inherit, except the daughter. She gets the fourth part of the share of a son, according to a passage in the book, Manu."<sup>15</sup> Alberuni must have been wrongly informed in the matter of succession of widows to property. But his statement is partially true with regard to the unmarried daughter, who, according to Manu, is entitled to get one-fourth of the share of the deceased father's property. Both Jimūtavāhana and Vijñāneśvara<sup>16</sup> preferred an unmarried daughter as heir to a married daughter. Alberuni could not possibly know the views of Gautama (28.22) and Yājñavalkya (II. 135) which has been quoted in the Mītāksharā prescribing that among the "married daughters the indigent (or unprovided for) one is to be preferred to one who is well-placed." Jimūtavāhana<sup>17</sup> was also in favour

of the succession of a married daughter having a son in preference to a widowed or barren daughter. But the *Sukranitisāra*<sup>18</sup> recommends that the unmarried daughter ought to get half of the son's share and the married daughter's son half of that. The daughter herself was to get one-eighth, while the widow was to receive one-fourth of the property of her deceased husband.

Epigraphic records and contemporary literature reveal that women sometimes held important positions in the State. Inscriptions refer to estates independently held by the Chāhamāna and Gāhaḍavāla queens.<sup>19</sup> Kalhaṇa refers to one *Dāmara* lady from Nilāśva who remained faithful to King Jayasīṃha at the time of Bhoja's revolt.<sup>20</sup> Thus some women owned by their right important estates even during the lifetime of their husbands. There are also plenty of instances which show the enormous political influence of women in Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh and Gujarat. Soon after the death of the Shāhiya prince Rudrapāla, King Ananta came under the influence of his able queen Sūryamatī. Thanks to her assumption of control over administration, the King became free from the heavy financial strains which had led earlier to the pawning of the royal diadem and the throne to a foreign trader. As a result of the appointment by Sūryamatī of able ministers like Kṣema, Keśava and also a servant of humble origin to the post of prime minister, peace and prosperity returned to Kashmir and the King was able to assert authority over the neighbouring hill-tracts. But the happy days came to an end soon. It was due to the misfortune that the Queen, in spite of the advice of wise counsellors, successfully persuaded the King to abdicate the throne in 1063 A. D. in favour of their son Kalaśa who was a licentious person. Soon after the coronation of Kalaśa, the royal couple regretted the decision. The resumption of regal functions by Ananta caused a rupture between the father and the son. As Ananta was weak enough to be induced by his wife, he committed the blunder of not imprisoning his son and lived a retired life in the sacred town of Vijayeśvara. Events

moved rapidly. Kalaśa set fire to the town, where his father was residing and deprived his parents of all the treasures. When Kalaśa insisted on sending Ananta to exile, the old King, after being insulted by his wife, committed suicide in 1081 A. D.

As autocracy was the normal form of government, there was bound to be much intrigue for succession to the throne, especially when the rival queens vied with one another for securing the nomination of their own son. The ladies in the harem became adept in palace intrigues. The Agni Purāṇa<sup>21</sup> warns the king against trusting a wife who has got a son. The queens played an important part in the drama of succession to the throne. The conspiracy which succeeded in enthroning Loṭhana, brother of Sussala and uncle of Jayasiṃha to the throne of Lohara in 1130 A.D. against King Jayasiṃha, drew support from some important ladies in the royal family.<sup>22</sup> Kalhaṇikā, the queen of Jayasiṃha, contributed most to the prosperity of Kashmir in about the middle of the twelfth century. She mediated in the quarrel between Bhoja and Jayasiṃha.<sup>23</sup> Another queen of Jayasiṃha, named Raḍḍādevī had also enormous influence. By marrying their daughters Menilā and Rājyaśrī, King Bhūpāla and Ghaṭotkacha respectively rose to an honourable position and the height of fortune.<sup>24</sup> Kalhaṇa also records about her that "owing to the constant attachment of the King, the punishment or reward even of princes depends immediately and without fail upon her will".<sup>25</sup> Merutuṅga tells us that Sūhava was angry with Jayachandra for refusing to declare her son as crown prince, invited the Turko-Afghans and ultimately caused the defeat and drowning of Jayachandra Gāhaḍavāla in the river.<sup>26</sup> A similar story has been related by Ferishta<sup>27</sup> with regard to the wife of the Rājā of Uch. The part played by Maṇalladevī, the mother of the Chaulukya King Jayasiṃha, is in refreshing contrast to the wives of the Rājās of Uch and Kanauj. She managed the affairs of the kingdom during the minority of her son.<sup>28</sup> Another noble Chaulukya lady was Nāṅkidevī, the mother of Mūlarāja II (1176-78 A.D.), who fought and defeated the

army of Turko-Afghans, probably of Muizuddīn bin Sām, at Gaḍaraghaṭṭa possibly near Mt. Abu.<sup>29</sup>

### *Their Political Activity:*

Not only members of the royal family, but also wives of feudatories and even ordinary women are known to have taken part in political affairs. There are instances from Kashmir during the reign of Jayasīṃha. The mother of Mallārjuna went on a political mission to bring about reconciliation between the two brothers, namely, King Jayasīṃha and her son.<sup>30</sup>

Some women of the eleventh and twelfth centuries were bold enough to take part in war too. Dr. D. C. Sircar<sup>31</sup> has referred to such Kashmir ladies as Chuḍḍā and Śillā who fought at the head of their troops. The Chaulukya queen Nāiki fought for the defence of Gujarat, "taking her son (Mūlarāja II) in her lap", records Merutuṅga. She is said to have "fought at Gaḍaraghaṭṭa and conquered the King of Mlechchas by the aid of a mass of rain clouds that came out of season attracted by her virtue". Urged by the same patriotic instinct the Rajput queen Karmadevī also fought against Qutubuddīn Aibak.<sup>32</sup>

There is, however, no specific reference to women acting as governors in the kingdoms of Northern India during our period. Dr. Altekar<sup>33</sup> has pointed out this fact. The Bhor State Museum plates dated Śaka 1001/1079 A.D. refer to ministers of Śrīdevī and Mahaladevī, queens of a feudatory of the Chaulukya kings.<sup>34</sup> But it must be pointed out that the history of Kashmir shows at least one specific instance of a Dāmari or female feudatory ruling in Nīlāsva during the reign of Jayasīṃha.<sup>35</sup>

### *Their education:*

As early marriage came to be advocated by the Smṛtis long before the Gupta period and accepted by the com-



mentators, there was very little opportunity for women to have higher education. In spite of this handicap, many women rose to fame as poetesses. Saduktikarṇāmṛta<sup>36</sup> quotes a poem by one Bhāvadevi, who may be presumed to have flourished during the period under survey. Bhojaprabandha<sup>37</sup> and Prabandhachintāmaṇi<sup>38</sup> relate that poetess Sītā studied not only the writings of Chāṇakya on morals and the principles of government, Raghuvamśa and the Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana but also the three Vedas. Literacy was probably acquired by the women of genteel society. Some of the sculptures of Bhuvanesvara and Khajuraho depict women as writing love-letters. Dhoyī in his Pavanadūtāṁ<sup>39</sup> also refers to such a practice. In the Viśvanātha temple at Khajuraho we find a sculpture depicting a woman reading from a book in front of a person, who is probably her teacher.

There are some other indications to show the improvement in the position of women. Manu did not concede to women the right to receive gifts (*pratigraha*). But Vallālasena in his Dānasāgara<sup>40</sup> draws support from Viṣṇudharmottara in extending the right to the father's sister, sister, aunt and the grandmother. Lakṣmīdhara<sup>41</sup> quotes Vyāsa to show that one acquires special merit by making gifts to wife, daughter, and mother on any occasion. Following the lead of Vallālasena and Lakṣmīdhara, the author of the Madanaratnapradīpa in the 15th century prescribed unqualified *dāna* to married women. He quotes the Viṣṇudharmottara which lays down that "a *dāna* to a woman should be given into the husband's palm and in no other way".<sup>42</sup> Dr. U. N. Ghoshal has referred to another instance of improvement of women's position during the Sena times in Bengal. The Senas are described as having brought about "a significant change in the formula of the royal landgrants so as to include the queen in the list of the king's informants". But we may point out that the queen in this respect was also recognised by the Gāhaḍavāla and Kalachuri kings.

*Purdah:*

The use of veil was customary with the ladies of northern India. The Edilpur copper-plate of Keśavasena tells us that as Keśavasena passed through the city, the ladies saw him and behaved in a coquettish way casting amorous glances. They, of course, gazed at him from the top of the skyscraping houses.<sup>43</sup> Slightly earlier than our period, we find the ladies of the harem of Mahābhavagupta I Janamejaya<sup>44</sup> (c. 950-975 A. D.) observing purdah in Orissa. The Kathāsaritsāgara also tells us that when Udayana entered Kausāmbī with Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī, some ladies peeped out at them from the windows, some "with their long-lashed eyes closely applied to the lattice of the windows".<sup>45</sup> The practice of covering one's face with a veil, however, was not universal amongst the women of all countries or of all classes. It appears from Dhoyī's descriptions that the system was not much in vogue at least among the women of Vijayapura, the capital of Lakṣmaṇasena. We have already seen how the Kashmir ladies of the royal family appeared before the public without any veil. Queen Raḍḍādevī, who had gone to crown her son at Lohara, openly accepted the homage of the vassals.<sup>46</sup>

The common womenfolk did not observe purdah at all under any circumstance. They had to earn their living by working in the open fields. Married women, as in Kauṭilya's or in Medhatithi's time were engaged in spinning and weaving and often engaged themselves in mechanical arts in order to supplement the income of their husbands.<sup>47</sup> A story in the Kathāsaritsāgara sums up the attitude towards the use of veils. Ratnaprabhā says "the strict seclusion of women is a mere social custom or rather folly produced by jealousy".<sup>48</sup>

In the inscriptions of the period under survey we find the ideal of the conjugal love amongst divine couples was held up before the people. The Rampala copper-plate states that Queen Śrīkāñchanā was to King Trailokyachandra what Śachī was to Indra, Gaurī to Hara and Śrī to Hari.<sup>49</sup> Similarly,

the Naihati copper-plate of Vallālasena compares Vilāsadevī, queen of Vijayasena, with Lakṣmī and Gaurī.<sup>50</sup> The highest aspiration for a woman was to become a faithful wife. Bilhaṇa draws a pen picture of the housewife who feels supreme attachment for her husband but at the same time is respectful to superiors and full of solicitude for the welfare of the younger ones and dependants as well as of other relatives. She behaves in the most friendly manner with her co-wives and is scrupulous in observing the *Vratas* and rituals.<sup>51</sup>

Usually a large number of persons belonging to three or four generations lived together. The Śukranītisāra states: "The chaste wife, step-mother, mother, daughter, father, widowed daughter or sister who has no offspring, aunt, brother's wife, sister, father or mother, grandfather, preceptor who has no son, father-in-law, uncles, grandson who is young and orphan, brother, sister's son—these must be maintained carefully to the best of one's ability even under adverse circumstances."<sup>52</sup> It was no easy job for the mistress of the house to maintain peace and order and at the same to minister to the comforts and well-being of such a big family.

#### REFERENCES TO CHAPTER V

##### *(Position of Women in Society)*

1. Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal.) IV. 4. 26-27.
2. Śuddhikāṇḍam p. 180-181
3. Grihasṭha p. 105 and Vijñāṇēśvara on Yāj. II. 148.
4. Jīmūtavāhana's views discussed in HB I. 610.
5. Cf. Manu III. 55
6. Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal.) III. 18.
7. Kane: HDS II. i, 580-581 for Smṛti rules.
8. Bodhisattvāvadāna Kalpalatā ed. Das p. 761.
9. Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal.) III. 51.
10. Grihasṭha, p. 421.
11. Grihasṭharatnākara p. 590-591
12. Struggle for Empire p. 483, 496
13. HB. I. 610; Mitter: *op. cit.* pp. 433-450; Kane: HDS III 701-712.
14. Majumdar, A. K. *op. cit.* pp. 334-336.
15. Sachau II. 164

16. Dāyabhāga XI. 2. 4 (ed. Jivananda p. 175): Vijñāneśvara on Yāj. II. 135.
17. Dāyabhāga XI. 2. 1-3
18. Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal.) IV. 5. 299-301
19. Fiefs of Naḍḍūla Chāhamāna Queen Jalhaṇādevī (Sanderav inscr. dated V.S. 1236/1179 A. D. in EI. XI. 51-52); Pratāpadevī, Queen of Harirāja (Tantoti inscr. dated V. S. 1251/1194 A. D. in EI. XX. 62); Queen of Jayachandra (Machhlisr cp. V.S. 1253/1197. A. D. in EI. X. 99).
20. RT. VIII. 3115
21. Agni Purāṇa Ch. 224. 42.
22. RT. VIII. 1820-1823.
23. *Ibid.* VIII. 3063-71, 3096-3106, 3118.
24. *Ibid.* VIII. 3394, 3398-99.
25. *Ibid.* VIII. 3393.
26. Prabandhachintāmaṇi (ed. and Tr. Tawney) pp. 183-185
27. Briggs I. 169-170. tells us that she succumbed to the secret promise of the Ghūrī chieftain that he would entrust the government to her and marry her daughter. Relying on this promise, the Queen murdered her husband. The kingdom, however, was captured by Mui-zu-dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī and the Queen was sent to Ghaznī. This statement of Firishta has been objected by Dr. Habibullah (The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India p. 37), accepted with reservation by Dr. Ishwari Prasad (Hist. of Mediaeval India p. 114) and without reservations by Sir W. Haig (CHL. III. 38).
28. Sandesara, B. J. in Great Women of India p. 362.
29. Prabandhachintāmaṇi, (Tr. Tawney) p. 154; BG I. i. 195, II. 460, 476, 486, 548, Sukritasaṅkīrtana II. 46. Sukritakīrtikallolīnī on verses 70-71; discussion on the identity of the invader in DHNI II. 1004-05 and Chaulukyas of Gujarat p. 132-133.
30. RT. VIII. 1968-1970
31. Great Women of India p. 290
32. Tod: Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan Vol. I. p. 242 (ed. Crooke)
33. Altekar, A. S.: State and Government in Ancient India (ed. 1949) p. 57; Cf. his article in Great Women p. 43.
34. EI. XXII. 188.
35. RT. VIII. 3115
36. Sadukti II. 47.1
37. Bhojaprabandha (ed. Bombay) pp. 88, 89, 147, 204.
38. Prabandhachintāmaṇi. (Tr. Tawney) p. 63; Singhi Jain p. 53f.
39. Pavanadūtam verse 40
40. Dānasāgara (ed. B. I.) Fasc. I. p. 23, verse 66.
41. Dānakāṇḍa p. 40
42. Madanaratnadānapradīpa p. 80
43. IB. III. p. 129 verse 23.

44. IHQ. XX. (1944) p. 242. (Kalibhana grant, line 15)
45. Kathāsaritsāgara (Tr. Tawney) Vol. II. p. 50.
46. RT. VIII. 3303
47. Cf. Dāyabhāga (ed. Colebrooke) p. 85
48. Kathāsaritsāgara (Tr. Tawney) Vol I. p. 334.
49. IB. III p. 7 verse 6.
50. *Ibid.* III. p. 77
51. ŚP. p. 564, No. 3756
52. Śukranītisāra (ed. Sarkar) Ch. III. 243-248

## CHAPTER VI

### The Educational System

The system of education as outlined in the *dharmaśāstras* and *nibandhas* fails to convey an adequate idea of the institutions and methods for imparting instructions to students of different categories in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. If one depends upon them exclusively, he would get no idea about the great universities of Nalanda and Vikramasila. The Brāhmaṇa digest-writers like Lakṣmīdhara and commentators like Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara confine their attention almost exclusively to the education of the Brāhmaṇas who would dedicate their life to the study and teaching of the Vedic lore. To them the object of education continued to be the attainment of that knowledge which enables a person to realise the complete identity of the self with the supreme absolute. All other subjects were looked down upon as *Aparā Vidyā*, inferior or delusive knowledge as contrasted to the *Parā Vidyā*. A long and arduous course of training, lasting for many years, or in some cases even throughout the life, was envisaged for the Brāhmaṇa who was expected to minister to the spiritual needs of the people. It is evident that these writers were not concerned with such training of pupils as would enable them to earn their livelihood by supplying goods and services required by the society.

A modern historian of socio-economic institutions, however, cannot ignore the fact that the highly-skilled architects of huge temples, the sculptors of beautiful images, the jewellers of excellent diadems and ornaments, the learned physicians, the wonderful chemists, who excited the admiration of Alberuni\* and thousand other persons, displaying technological

\* When Alberuni failed to learn the science of alchemy and preparation of a compound with gold, he observed, "The adepts in

skill in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, must have had some sort of education. People engaged in agriculture, industries, trade and banking as well as the learned professions like medicine and engineering had an overwhelmingly numerical superiority over the Brāhmaṇas. But the Brāhmaṇa writers did not, as a rule, condescend to take any notice of their method of education. We have shown already that they regarded all those, who earned their livelihood by professing any of the fine arts, as socially inferior, though we find in the Chhāndogya Upaniṣada (VII. 1. 2) no less a personage than Nārada as an expert in *Devajānavidyā* which included arts like dancing and singing. The *Smṛtichandrikā* (II p. 195) quotes Brhaspati to indicate that the *śilpas* or crafts like dancing or preparing ornaments of gold are to be learnt by persons in the house of masters, under whom a period of apprenticeship has got to be served. Vijñāneśvara in course of explaining Yājñavalkya (II. 184) lends support to the view that the apprentice had to stipulate definitely the period during which he would stay with the master who would be entitled to appropriate the proceeds from his work, on providing him with board and lodging only. The learned author of the *Mitākṣarā* regards *Āyurveda* as a *śilpa* which is to be learnt under the same apprentice system. It may be recalled in this connection that *Āyurveda* (medicine), *Dhanurveda* (military science), *Gāndharvaveda* (music and dancing) and *Arthaśāstra* (the science of public administration) had in ancient India the status of *Upa-Vedas*, which were affiliated to *R̥gveda*, *Sāmaveda*, *Yajur* and *Atharvavedas* respectively. Even *Aparārka*, who flourished in the first half of the twelfth century, quotes a verse of the *Vishṇu-Purāṇa* showing that

this art try to keep it concealed, and shrink back from intercourse with those who do not belong to them. Therefore I have not been able to learn from the Hindus which methods they follow in this science and what element they principally use." (Ed. Sachau, Vol. I., p. 187).

these, along with the traditional fourteen, namely, the four Vedas, six Vedāṅgas and Logic, Mīmāṃsā, Purāṇa, Itihāsa and the Dharmaśāstras, constitute the eighteen Vidyās or subjects of learning.

The Śukranītisāra treats Arthaśāstra as an independent Vidyā and not as an Upa-Veda like Āyurveda, Dhanurveda and Gāndharvaveda. This work says that ten *Kalās* are derived from Āyurveda, namely, preparation of alcohol, surgical operations, cooking, gardening, metallurgy, confectionery, pharmacy, analysis and synthesis of metals, alloys and salts. Though there is an apparent incongruity in jumbling up subjects like cooking and confectionery with surgery, metallurgy and chemistry, yet it gives us an indication of the technological courses which were taught in mediaeval India. Much research work was done in Āyurveda in this period. The Chikitsāsāmaṅgraha, popularly known as 'Chakradatta' and the Lohapaddhati of Suresvara deal with metallic preparations and their use in medicine. One of the monasteries excavated at Nalanda contains big ovens indicating that chemical experiments used to be shown to the students there. The science of metallurgy is described in almost contemporary works like Rasaratnasamuchchaya, Rasārṇava Rasendrachūḍāmaṇi, Rasa-prakāśa-sudhākara. Seven *Kalās*, namely dancing, playing on musical instruments, decorations, antics, laying out beds, jugglery, and erotics were affiliated to the Gāndharvavidyā. The Dhanurveda had five branches<sup>1</sup>, namely, taking up of stands for the employment of arms, duelling, marking, battle arrays and employment of horses, chariots etc. Besides these Śukranītisāra enumerates some technological subjects like the construction of palaces and buildings, excavation of tanks and canals, manufacture of clocks, watches and musical instruments, dyeing, testing of metals, preparation of artificial gems and metals, enamelling, extraction and preparation of oils from fats and seeds, glass-work, work in iron foundries, testing of gems, rope-making, thread-spinning, weaving, polishing of earthen, wooden,



stone, and metallic vessels, and drawing. We do not get information from any book regarding the details of the method of teaching of some of these highly technical subjects at a period when there was neither any engineering college nor any technological institution. There was an extensive literature on Vāstuvidyā dealing with the principles of Indian architecture. At least two important works on the subject, the Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra and the Iśāna-Śiva-guru-paddhati, were composed respectively in northern and southern India during the eleventh century. These are written in Sanskrit language and not in a very easy style. The architects, therefore, must be presumed to have a sound knowledge of Sanskrit. Speaking of the education of the Vaiśyas, *Manusmṛiti*<sup>2</sup> states that the Vaiśya should know the qualities and defects of soils, the sowing of seed, the prices of jewels, coral and pearls, of metals and clothes, of perfumes and salt, and he should also be familiar with measures and weights, the different grades of qualities of goods, the profit and loss in trade, the rates of pay for servants various alphabets and the places where saleable articles are manufactured or produced. It was not possible, indeed, for the same man to be an expert in all these diverse subjects; but while some specialised in agricultural science, some in economic geography, some in accountancy or salesmanship, every successful farmer and businessman was expected to be familiar not only with the alphabet of his own language but also with alphabets of his customers and suppliers of goods. Lakṣmīdhara refers to the gift of education in agricultural science and the art of making images in his *Dānakāṇḍa*<sup>3</sup>. We have already shown in *Chapter Three* that the number of Śūdras swelled in the period under survey and that many of them lived by pursuing professions which were monopolised by the Vaiśyas in earlier periods. The better class of Śūdras and especially persons engaged in trade and industries may be presumed to have an elementary knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

### *Primary Education :*

Education began at the early age of five. The initiation of a boy into reading and writing took place on an auspicious day.<sup>4</sup> The young pupil saluted first the deities like Hari, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, *Vidyā* of his family and the sūtra-kāras of that particular *vidyā* and the *vidyā* of his choice<sup>5</sup>. The *Smṛtichandrikā* quotes an unnamed smṛti which recommends that the curriculum should consist of a primer (*mātrikānyāsa*) and arithmetic.<sup>6</sup>

Studentship for long terms began to be disfavoured from the days of Medhātithi. Both the *Smṛtichandrikā* and Lakṣmīdhara prescribed that it was enough to learn one Veda only which required a period of twelve<sup>7</sup> years. Lakṣmīdhara however eulogises the life of a *naiṣṭhika brahmachārī*, one who remains celibate and a student throughout his life.<sup>8</sup>

Mediaeval digests prescribed disciplined life for the students who would receive Brāhmaṇical education. The system of begging for daily food, rules of cleanliness, observance of *sandhyā*, *upāsana* (twilight prayers), tending of fire, restraint of sense organs and other rules for the *brahmachārī* continued to be observed and are mentioned by Lakṣmīdhara.<sup>9</sup>

### *Courses of Study :*

As for the courses of study, Lakṣmīdhara quoting Bṛhaspati urges that it is the duty of a Brāhmaṇa first to study the Veda and then Smṛti and Sadāchāra. Referring to the rule of Manu 12. 95-96, he states clearly that those subjects which are contrary to the Smṛti like the worship of Chaityas and the Buddhist scriptures are to be avoided specially<sup>10</sup>. But a perusal of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* shows that besides the Vedas other subjects were also taught.

The most important and compulsory subject in the Brāhmaṇical education was the Veda. All over North India the Vedas were widely studied. It is impossible, however, to controvert the statement of Alberuni that no doubt the

Brāhmaṇas recited the Vedas but very few of them knew their meaning, and "still less is the number of those who master the contents of the Veda and their interpretation to such a degree as to be able to hold a theological disputation." The correctness of the observation of Alberuni can be shown from the *Brāhmaṇa-Sarvasva*.<sup>11</sup> Halāyudha, (the author of *Brāhmaṇa-Sarvasva*) writes that the Utkalas and Pāśchātyas simply memorize the Veda. On the other hand the Rāḍhīyas and Vārendras of Bengal pay more attention to the sacrificial application of the *Mantras* and study the meaning of only a portion of the Vedic texts in the light of the Mīmāṃsā School, without memorising them.<sup>12</sup> The defective nature of the Vedic studies may be seen in Kashmir too. Adityadarśana's statement shows that the decadence of Vedic scholarship existed for a long time. Living in the middle of the Muslim period of Kashmir, he laments, 'Priests, claiming Vedic knowledge read the Vedas, as a rule, very superficially and cannot understand the meaning of even a word from them. They are satisfied with mere recitation of texts.'<sup>13</sup> Hence in order to bring about an immediate improvement in the studies, Halāyudha wrote his *Brāhmaṇasarvasva*. For those who could not read the entire Vedic literature, he collected something like 400 *mantras*. He himself admitted that the book was meant only for the followers of the Kāṇva recension of the Vājasaneyī Yajurveda, and particularly for the Rāḍhīya and Vārendra Brahmanas.<sup>14</sup> It is certain that only some parts of the Vedas were memorised by the students. Oral teaching of the Vedas was favoured in Northern India in the twelfth century<sup>15</sup> A.D. Both Lakṣmīdhara and Alberuni inform us that the Vedas are to be studied in secluded areas and open fields.<sup>16</sup> Lakṣmīdhara also tells us that the instruction in the Vedas are neither to be given in the towns, roads, nor before the Śūdras and barbers.<sup>17</sup> But contemporary epigraphic and literary records show that the Vedas were recited in important *tirthas* and towns like Banaras,<sup>18</sup> Gaya<sup>19</sup> and Nāgaratīrtha<sup>20</sup>

The Dharmaśāstras and Purāṇas were widely read by

students. Grammar and astrology gained ascendancy during the period under survey. Not only were there numerous recasts of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, but also new schools of grammar by Jainendra, Kātantra and Hemachandra.<sup>21</sup> On astrology, there were innumerable compositions like Bhoja's *Rājanārtanḍa*, *Bhīmaparākrama* and *Bhujabalanibandha*,<sup>22</sup> Someśvara's *Mānasollāsa*, Bhavadeva's works etc. Some works on astronomy like *Rājamṛgāṅka* of Bhoja and *Bhāsvatī* of Śatānanda were written in the 11th century. The Dvyāśraya informs us that the Chalukya King Jayasīṃha established a school for studying Jyotiṣa.<sup>23</sup> A chieftain of Khandesh also established a college for the study of astronomer Bhāskara-chārya's works.<sup>24</sup>

Logic continued to be a favourite subject of study. Prof. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya has written a long article on the study of Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara schools in Bengal from the days of Śrīdhara, author of *Nyāyakandalī* to Chaṇḍīdāsa of the 13th century A.D. His contention is proved by references in *Chakradattasaṅgraha*, *Prabodhachandrodaya* (II. 3 and 7), *Chaturvargachintāmaṇi* of Hemādri, *Dvaitanirṇaya* of Vāchaspati Miśra, *Kāvyaaprakāśadīpikā* (Ch. V) of Chaṇḍīdāsa, *Laṭakamelaka* of Śaṅkhaadhara (Act II. 16).<sup>25</sup> Murāri, the composer of the Gaya inscription of Yaśvapāla was a prominent student of Nyāya.<sup>26</sup> A college of Nyāya was also established by the Chaulukya King Jayasīṃha.<sup>27</sup> Curiously enough, we find that for the first time in Indian curriculum the Kauṭilya *Arthaśāstra* was introduced in the twelfth century. Gaṅgādhara, a minister of the Kalachuri King Ratnadeva III of Ratanpur, was well versed in the science of Chāṇakya.<sup>28</sup> Malladeva, a Brāhmaṇa poet of Anahillapātaka, was also well-versed in the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya.<sup>29</sup>

Specialisation in some branches of the Vedas and Vedāṅgas was the order of the day. But some scholars acquired knowledge in a large variety of subjects. Thus Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva of Bengal was proficient not only in Advaitabrahmaṇa, but also in Mīmāṃsā, Tantras, astrology and Buddhist philosophy.

Hemachandra and Kṣemendra were polymaths of the age. Instances of such scholars can be multiplied.

### *Education of a Prince :*

Princes received a specialised type of education. They were trained in such a manner that they could become scholars as well as administrators. Such scholar-kings of our period are Bhoja of Paramāra dynasty, Someśvara III of the Chālukya dynasty of Kalyāṇa and Vallālasena of the Sena dynasty. A perusal of the chapter on the 'Protection of the Prince' in the Rājadharmakāṇḍa shows that the princes of the period under survey received an education which did not differ much from that imparted in ancient India. He learnt the *sūtras* relating to Dharma, Artha, Kāma, crafts, as well as archery and physical exercises.<sup>30</sup> A similar type of education is also recommended in *Mānasollāsa*.<sup>31</sup> That the princes received education in Kāmaśāstra is evident from the recommendations in Agni Purāṇa and the Bṛhaspatya Arthaśāstra.<sup>32</sup>

### *Relation between Teacher and Pupil :*

Dr. U. N. Ghoshal has discussed the relation between the Vedic teacher and his pupil in matters of fees, punishment to students and the three higher castes who were admitted to schools. The Brahmachārikāṇḍa of Lakṣmīdhara also gives similar details on this matter.<sup>34</sup> Here we shall again refer to some striking features mentioned by him. Lakṣmīdhara quoting a passage of the Āpastamba (I. 8. 24-28) tells us that the teacher should love his pupil like a son and he should be attentive to all his needs.<sup>35</sup> No teacher has the right of withholding his knowledge from a student. *Vidyā* is not the property of a teacher, but it is to be regarded as a deposit with him.<sup>35</sup> It is interesting to note that Lakṣmīdhara does not like that students should associate with teachers who are enemies of the state. Similarly, a student should not take lessons from an immoral teacher. The same writer also refers to the relation between the student and the members

of the teacher's family in a short chapter entitled *Guruputrabhōryānuvṛtīh* in *Brahmachārikāṇḍa*. The son of the teacher is entitled to veneration similar to that shown to the teacher but the pupil is not to eat the remnants of food, nor to shampoo the body, nor wash the feet of the guru's son. Quoting Manu (II. 210-215), he further states that the wife of the teacher is entitled to the same honour as shown to the teacher. But no student should touch their body nor help them in their toilet. The feet of the low-born wives of the Guru are not to be touched.<sup>40</sup>

### *Monastic establishments :*

During the period under survey, the following were the notable monasteries imparting education. In Bihar flourished the Nalanda, Vikramasila, Odantapuri, and Phullahari monasteries near Monghyr. Inscriptions and literature show that some of the famous *vihāras* or Buddhist monasteries were also located in North and Eastern Bengal, as for example, Jagaddala, Somapura and Devikota in North Bengal, Vikramapuri in Dacca, Pattikeraka in Comilla and Panditavihāra in Chittagong. Similar centres in the Uttar Pradesh were situated in Sarnath<sup>41</sup> and Jetavana.<sup>42</sup> In Kashmir the following were the notable *vihāras* : Diddā, Indradevībhavana, Chaṅkuṇa, Ratnadevī, Bhālerakaprapā, Sulla, Bijja and another on the banks of the river Vitastā.<sup>43</sup> Sussalā, the wife of the minister Rilhana, built some halls for students.<sup>44</sup> The Nalanda inscription of Vipulaśrimitra tells us that Vipulaśrimitra in the fourth year of Mahendrapāla (c. 900 A.D.) carried out repairs at the monastery of Pitāmaha at Choyaṇḍaka.<sup>45</sup> A minor *vihāra* was in existence at Gaya which was established by Brāhmaṇa in the fifty-first year of Lakṣmaṇasena<sup>46</sup>. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* (XXXII. 42-43) speaks of a monastery at Valabhī. A perusal of the Charkhari plate of Paramardideva dated 1178 A. D. suggests that a monastery possibly existed in Bundelkhand.<sup>47</sup> We have no means to find out whether the monasteries noticed by Hiuen Tsang in the places mentioned below

continued to flourish in the eleventh-twelfth centuries A.D.: Nagarkot, Udyana, Jalandhara, Mathura, Sthanesvara, Srughna, Matipura, Brahmapura, Govisana, Ahichchatra, Samkasya, Kanauj, Navadevakula, Ayodhya, Hayamukha, Prayaga, Visoka, Kapilavastu, Banaras, Ramagrama, Ghazipur, Tilosika, Gunamati, Silabhadra near Gaya, Kajangala, Pundravardhana, Kamarupa, Samatata, Tamralipti, Orissa, Berar, Malwa, Valabhi, Anandapura, Surat, Ujjayini and Chitor. Amongst these places Nepal and Orissa became famous centres of Tantric Buddhism in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D.

Most of the Buddhist educational institutions were maintained and aided by royal patronage. The Pāla kings established and gave large donations to Nalanda, Vikramasila, Odantapuri and the Jagaddalavihāra in Varendrī. The kings, queens and ministers of Kashmir erected, repaired and endowed several monasteries. Queen Kumāradevī and her husband Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla resuscitated and endowed monasteries at Sarnath and Jetavana. A feudatory of the Gāhaḍavālas, named Vidyādhara, though a Śaiva established a monastery at Jāvrīsa.<sup>48</sup> Sometimes an ascetic like Vipulaśrīmitra repaired and established convents at Nalanda and Choyaṇḍaka.<sup>49</sup> One Brāhmaṇ named Dāmodara erected a *vihāra* at Gaya in the fifty-first year of Lakṣmaṇasena.<sup>50</sup>

These monasteries imparted education to students from all parts of India and abroad. Many scholars have given details of the native and foreign scholars at the Nalanda monasteries since the fifth century A.D. Even in the early thirteenth century A.D. the Tibetan scholar Dharmasvāmin Śrī Chag-lo-tsa-ba came to study at Nalanda.<sup>51</sup> The University of Vikramasila<sup>52</sup> gathered reputed teachers like Śākyaśrī from Kashmir, Ratnakīrti, Vairochana, Kanakaśrī and Buddhaśrī from Nepal. The Jetavana convent at Sravasti attracted teachers and scholars from distant areas of India in the days of Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla. Here lived the teacher Śākya-rakṣita, hailing from Utkala or Orissa and his student

Vāgīśvararakṣita from Chola country.<sup>53</sup> The *Kathāsaritśāgara*<sup>54</sup> relates how a Brāhmaṇa named Vasudatta, belonging to the Antardedī region in the Ganges-Yamuna Valley, sent his sixteen-year-old son Viṣṇudatta to the University of Valabhī for education. The famous monasteries afforded a common platform for the free association of scholars belonging to different parts of India and her neighbouring countries.

### *Writing of Books in Vihāra :*

Many original books and commentaries were written in the monasteries and especially at Nalanda, Vikramasīla, Phullahari in Bihar, Paṇḍita Vihāra, Sannagara and Jagaddala<sup>55</sup> by famous scholars like Atīśa Dīpaṅkara, Abhayākaragupta, Vanaratna, Vibhūti-chandra, Dānaśīla, Mokṣhākaragupta, and Subhākaragupta. Kumārachandra and Dharmākara composed works on Tantra and Samvaravyākhyā in the universities of Vikramapuri (Dacca) and Jagaddala (Rajshahi) respectively.<sup>56</sup> At Sarnatha, a devout Mahāyāna Buddhist lady named Māmakā caused the compilation of a copy of the Aṣṭasāhaśrīkā in a monastery known as the *Saddharma-chakra-pravartana-vihāra*<sup>57</sup> in KS 810/1058 A.D. Kṣemendra tells us that he wrote *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* in a cave convent. In the quiet atmosphere of the Ratnagupta and Ratnaraśmī *vihāras* of Kashmir, many Mahāyāna works were translated into Tibetan language in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.<sup>58</sup>

The heads of these *vihāras* tried to maintain a rigid control over students and teachers. Atīśa during his stay at the Vikramasīla monastery, did not hesitate to expel Tantric teachers like Natekana and Vajrapāṇi, and a priest named Divākarachandra, who led a married life.<sup>59</sup> It appears, however, that the vast wealth of the monasteries exercised a corrupting influence in the twelfth century. Merutuṅga quotes an adage to the effect that for one who holds office in the state for three months or functions as abbot of a monastery for three days, hell is certain.<sup>60</sup> 'An interesting sidelight of the result of allowing women to enter monastic institu-



tion is reflected in the *Samayamātrikā* of Kṣemendra.<sup>61</sup> A prostitute took shelter in the Kṛityāśramavihāra, and changing her name to Vajraghaṇṭā, became a nun and pretended to worship. A large number of bangles made of conchshell have been found during the excavations at Nalanda ; but we do not know whether at any period nuns were allowed to live there.

The Jainas also imparted instructions in monasteries. We have only two inscriptions relating to the Jaina *vihāra* during our period. The Kuvara (Kumāra) *vihāra* was erected in VS 1221/1165 A.D. on the fort of Kāñchanagiri near modern Jalor (Rajputana) by the Chalukya King Kumārapāla. It was later on rebuilt by the Bhāṇḍārī Yaśovīra under the orders of the Chāhamāna King Samarasimha in V. S. 1242/1185 A. D.<sup>62</sup>

### *Maṭhas:*

The *Maṭhas* in some respects were the counterparts of monasteries of mediaeval Europe. These were usually managed by the followers of religions other than Buddhism. The Kashmiri kings like Ananta, Uccala and Jayasimha built *maṭhas*<sup>63</sup>. The latter established permanent endowments for all the *maṭhas*. But a still larger number of such educational institutions were founded and endowed by queens, princesses, ministers and other Kāyasthas in Kashmir,<sup>64</sup> especially during the reign of king Jayasimha (1128-1155 A.D.) A king named Vaidyanātha of Orissa built a *maṭha*.<sup>65</sup> Similar patronage to learning by the establishment of *maṭhas* was shown by the Kalachuri<sup>66</sup> and Chalukya Kings of Gujarat. It is interesting to note here that sometimes officials built such educational institutions abroad. Kandarpa, even after retirement, beautified the eastern region of Banaras with *maṭhas*.<sup>67</sup>

The very fact that the *agrahāras* were attached to the *maṭhas* shows that there were residential arrangements for students and teachers. Ksemendra refers to students from Gauḍa staying in Kashmir.<sup>68</sup> The *maṭhas* founded by Jayasimha's minister, Alankāra<sup>69</sup> and the Commander-in-Chief

Udaya<sup>70</sup> had numerous '*brahmapurīs*'. The word *brahmapuri* means either a residence of Brāhmaṇas or a city inhabited by Brāhmaṇas.<sup>71</sup>

Temples were attached usually to *maṭhas*, as we find in case of *vihāras*. The *maṭhas* built by the minister Mañkha had a large number of Śiva images and *lingas*.<sup>72</sup> Verse 85 of the Bijholi Rock inscription of the Chāhamāna King Someśvara dated V. S. 1226/1170 A. D. informs us that a *maṭha* was attached to the Jaina temple of Pārśvanāth, which was situated on the bank of the river Revā.<sup>73</sup>

Another notable feature of the Kashmiri *maṭhas* was that all persons who arrived there, were provided with food. King Jayasiṃha erected a *maṭha* in honour of Chandālā and provided it with ample means, and from its door no guest was turned away<sup>74</sup>.

The Śaiva teachers of the Mattamayūra clan studied various orthodox and heterodox religious books and philosophy.<sup>75</sup> They had a series of *maṭhas*. Purandara first established a *maṭha* at Mattamayūra and then at Ranipadra<sup>76</sup> in the first half of the ninth century A.D. His fourth successor Vyomaśiva enlarged and repaired the latter *maṭha*. A perusal of the Bilhari and Chandrehe inscriptions would suggest that the third spiritual successor of Purandara, also called Pulandara, had established himself at Madhumatī (identified by Mirashi with the village Mahua, in Terahi). Hridayaśiva, the grand-disciple of Purandara alias Madhumateya, received charge of the royal *maṭhas* of Vaidyanātha and Nauhāleśvara in the latter half of the 10th century A.D. Hridayaśiva handed over the management of the latter *maṭha* to his disciple Aghoraśiva. Another branch of the Mattamayūra clan lived at the Golaki *maṭha* at Bheraghat which is about 10 miles from Tripurī, the capital of the Kalachuri Kings. Vimalaśiva, the Rājaguru of the Kalachuri King Jayasiṃha, was a pupil of Kīrttiśiva of the Golaki-*maṭha*, Vimalaśiva erected a number of *maṭhas*.<sup>77</sup> Viśveśvaraśambhu, another pupil of the Golaki-*maṭha* did the greatest service by establishing many educa-

tional institutions at different spots, viz., Viśveśvara Golakī. Cudappa, Kurnool, Guntur and North Arcot in modern Andhra and Madras states, in the first half of the 13th century.<sup>78</sup>

Like the Buddhist monastic establishments, the *maṭhas* also attracted scholars from distant places. We have already seen that Kashmiri *maṭhas* attracted students from Gauḍa. The foundation of Siṅhapura had a large number of brāhmaṇas who hailed from the Indus region and also from Drāviḍa region.<sup>79</sup> The Golakīmaṭha at Bheraghat had pupils like Vimalaśiva who hailed from Kerala and his disciple's disciple Viśveśvaraśambhu, a resident of Pūrvagrāma in Southern Rāḍha in Gauḍa<sup>80</sup>.

The renowned *maṭhas* did not suffer from want of money. The Ranod inscription of the end of the tenth or eleventh century A. D. refers to the prosperity of a renovated *maṭha* at Ranipadra in these lines: "There had been abundance of corn plants outside and plenty of jewels inside it; and also tall horses which were neighing and the haughty rutting elephants were crying."<sup>81</sup> The Malkapuram inscription gives an insight into the elaborate arrangements for education provided in the Viśveśvara Golakīmaṭha which, however, was situated in the Andhra country. Sixty Brāhmaṇa families were imported from the Tamil country. "In addition to these there were Brahmins well versed in the three Vedas, in grammar, in logic and in general literature and five others skilled in philosophy... The village had also a physician and an accountant (*kāyastha*), six Brāhmin servants were provided for the choultry and the *maṭha*, two for cooking and four for performing other miscellaneous duties. Ten persons bearing the appellation Virabhadras were appointed as guardian of the village... The village was also provided with a set of ten artisans, consisting of a goldsmith, a coppersmith, a blacksmith, a carpenter (*Kāru*), a stone-mason, a maker of stone-images *silpī*, a basket-maker (*vaiṇśakārah*), a potter and a barber headed by a master artisan Sthapati... The temple

establishment consisted of ten dancing girls, eight persons to play on musical instruments of various sorts, fourteen singers, six persons for beating drums etc., and a Kashmirian whose duties are not stated. A number (not specified) of Brāhmaṇas from Viśveśvaraśiva's native village were employed to keep accounts of the income and expenditure of the village and temple. All the above-mentioned persons were assigned lands for their emoluments and they were allowed to enjoy these lands from generation to generation with rights of ownership... To supervise the administration of the charity a superintendent āchārya was appointed with an allowance *āchārya bhogam* of one hundred nishkas (a year presumably)."<sup>82</sup> The association of dancing girls with a centre where education was to be imparted must have had a disastrous consequence on the moral character of the teachers and students.

*Mathas*, by receiving endowments, had contacts with contemporary kings. The Śaiva *āchāryas* of the Mattamayūra clan became spiritual preceptors of several kings of the Chedi Dynasty for over three centuries. The kings who invited the teachers of the Mattamayūra *mathas*, were Yuvarājadeva I, Lakṣmaṇarāja, Yaśahkaṇa, Gayākaṇa, Narasiṃha, Jayasiṃha and Vijayasiṃha. The social status of the authorities of these educational institutions was sufficiently high.

Alberuni refers to Varanasi and the *Kuṭṭanīmatam*<sup>83</sup> and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* to Pataliputra<sup>84</sup> as great centres of learning. Somadeva relates how Devadatta of the Gangetic valley and Kālanemī and Vigatābhaya of Malwa went to Pataliputra for studies.<sup>85</sup> Mithila began to rise in prominence as a centre of learning towards the end of the 12th century. Another centre of Sanskrit learning was, at Mt. Abu.<sup>86</sup> Here, according to *Dvyāśraya* of Hemachandra, many foreign students came to receive education. Learned scholars of this age exchanged their ideas in convocations and learned assemblies convened for the purpose. We hear of a convocation of scholars and learned men convened by Alarṅkāra, minister of the court of Jayasiṃha of Kashmir. Maṅkha tells

us that King Govindachandra of Kanauj sent Suhala as a delegate to that assembly.<sup>87</sup> The *Paṇḍits* of all the states of Northern India took part in learned discussions. In Bengal we hear of Bhavadeva, who is described in Bhuvanesvar inscription, as stoutly opposing the Buddhist and heretic dialecticians.<sup>88</sup> We learn from the *Kharataragachhapattāvalī* that the Chāhamāna King Pṛthivirāja III and his Sarvādrikārin Kaimāsa presided over a discussion between Nārāyaṇa and Jinapati Sūri.<sup>89</sup> The meeting was also attended by the court *paṇḍits* like Vāgiśvara, Janārdana Gauḍa and Vidyāpati. Another *paṭṭāvalī* of the Jaina sect, informs us that Jineśvara defeated the *Chaityavāsīs* or Buddhists before the royal court of the Chalukya King Durlabharāja in V. S. 1080/1023 A. D.<sup>90</sup> But more significant was the debate between the Śvetāmbara teacher Devachandra Sūri, preceptor of Hemachandra and the Digambara scholar named Kumudachandra, hailing from Kaṇṇāṭa in the presence of King Jayasimha Siddharāja on the full moon day of Vaiśākha in V. S. 1181/c. 1124 A. D.<sup>91</sup> The incident is related in the contemporary drama *Mudrita-Kumudachandra* and also in the *Prabandhachinlāmanī*<sup>92</sup> and the *Prabhāvakacharita*<sup>93</sup>. The subject of the dispute was the salvation of women. The Digambara *āchārya* was defeated after several days of discussion. The defeat was so decisive that Śvetāmbara doctrine became the legal Jaina doctrine in Gujarat.<sup>94</sup> The Dubkund inscription of V. S. 1145/1088 A. D. also relates that the Jaina *guru* Śāntiṣena defeated hundreds of disputants before the court of King Bhoja of Malwa.<sup>95</sup>

### *Economic Condition of Teachers :*

The teachers of our period often received rewards from kings and feudatory princes.<sup>96</sup> We hear of some teachers who were royal preceptors, e.g., Mahāmahopādhyāya Aniruddha as teacher of Vallālasena<sup>97</sup>, Jinadatta Sūri<sup>98</sup> and Hemachandra of Kumārapāla. They were undoubtedly recipients of large sums of money. Someśvara in his *Mānasollāsa* tells us that when the education of the prince was completed,

the teacher was amply rewarded with clothes, gold, land and even villages.<sup>99</sup> King Harṣa in his early years of kingship adorned learned men with jewels and bestowed upon them the privilege of (using) litters, horses, parasols etc.<sup>100</sup> Jayasiṁha made the grants of unimpaired fields and houses to men of learning.<sup>101</sup> Kalhaṇa remarks on the king's piety in these lines, "Safe is the journey for scholars who follow him as their caravan-leader on the path on which his intuition guides, and which has been found by his knowledge".<sup>102</sup> A certain king Govindarāja of Saurāṣṭra gave several plots of land for supporting learned Brāhmaṇas and their pupils.<sup>103</sup> Such grants to learned men are recommended by the contemporary digest-maker Lakṣmīdhara<sup>104</sup> and also in Śukranīṭisāra.<sup>105</sup> In spite of liberal grants of some princes to certain teachers, the teaching class as a whole remained wedded to poverty. Dāmodaragupta tells us that none excepting the teaching section of the community was unhappy at Banaras.<sup>106</sup> Many scholars disdained to accept any gift from royal patrons. Prahāsa, a Bengal scholar, refused to accept 900 gold coins in cash and a landed property yielding 1000 coins from Jayapāladeva, a king of Kāmarūpa,<sup>107</sup> in the eleventh century. Similarly, a Jaina ācārya called Jinavallabha boldly refused to accept three villages or 3,00,000 *pāruttha drammas* from Naravarman, the Paramāra King of Malwa (c. 1097-1111 A.D.). He requested the king, instead, to grant him only two *pāruttha drammas* from the customs house of Chitore for defraying the expenses of two temples of the Kharatara Jainas.<sup>108</sup> Kṣemendra opines that real scholars and men of learning should neither impart instructions in lieu of money nor should they go to the royal courts.<sup>109</sup>

#### *Scholars going Abroad :*

Many scholars were invited to Tibet and China during this period. Not only Dīpaṅkara Śrījñāna but also, according to Rahula Sankṛityayana, Paṇḍit Somanāth, Lakṣmīnīkara, Dānaśrī, Chandrarāhula, Gayādhara, Pha-dam-pa-sangs-gyars,

Mitrayogī or Jaganmitrananda, Śākyaśrī and nine other scholars went to Tibet in between 1027 A.D. and 1203 A.D. Of these Somnanātha and Śākyaśrī belonged to Kashmir, Gayādhara to Vaiśālī and Mitrayogī to Raḍha.<sup>110</sup> Pha-dam-pa-sangs-gyars visited China in 1101 A.D.<sup>111</sup> Earlier in between 973 and 1001 A.D. went the famous Fa-Hien (Dharmadeva) from Nalanda and later on in the later half of the eleventh century went Dharmarakṣa, Maitreyabhadra and Sūryayaśas from Magadha to China.<sup>112</sup> Julien informs us of other North Indian educationists who arrived in China between 1025 and 1034 A.D. with presents of Buddhist manuscripts and relics of the Buddha.<sup>113</sup>

Similarly, a large number of Chinese and Tibetan pilgrims came to India for studying Buddhist scriptures as well as for pilgrimage. Several Chinese pilgrims' inscriptions are noticeable at Gaya. They date back to 1022, 1023 and 1033 A.D.<sup>114</sup> The flow of the Chinese pilgrims in the 12th century ceased but the Tibetans continued to visit the Buddhist centres of learning. In between 958 and 1055 A.D. as many as twenty-one students studied at Kashmir. Pandit Rahula Sankrityayana informs us that the Tibetan scholars, Blo-Idan-sesa-rab (1059-1108 A.D.) studied at Kashmir at the feet of the famous teachers Parahitabhadra and Bhavyarāja, Varilo-cha-va under an *āchārya* at Bodh Gaya.<sup>115</sup> Marpa (983-1081 A.D.) came to India thrice, and he had the good fortune of meeting Śrībhadrā of Nalanda and Dipaṅkara at Vikramasila and Akara Siddhi at Phullahari in Monghyr.<sup>116</sup> The cultural contact between India and Tibet did not come to an end even with the Turko-Afghan invasions. Dharmasvāmin Sri Chag-lo-tsaba studied at Nalanda, Gaya and Vaiśālī in the second and third decades of the thirteenth century.<sup>117</sup>

#### *Literacy vs. Education :*

The recitation of the age-old Epics and Purāṇas trained men to take note of the moral values of life. Madanapāla

of the Pāla dynasty and Govindarāja of Saurāṣṭra made land grants to the reciters of the Mahābhārata and sacred texts respectively<sup>118</sup> in the eleventh century. Kṣemendra in his Darpadalana describes beautifully the aims and objectives of education: one who is really educated dedicates his life to the promotion of good to humanity, distinguishes between right and wrong, *śaucha* and *aśaucha*, and does not perform magic and miracles and sell his learning.<sup>119</sup> Even Dīpaṅkara, the living lamp of learning of the East, had to use mystic charms to ward off the brigands who tried to steal a little sandalwood table in Nepal on his way to Tibet.<sup>120</sup> The use of magic by the Tāntric teachers is well-known.

#### *Effects of Turko-Afghan Raids :*

But a great change in the educational system and the life of educationists came in with the Turko-Afghan invasions. Alberuni himself writes that he did not see any new scientific research.<sup>121</sup> But even these scanty remains of Hindu sciences "retired far away from those parts of the country conquered by us, and have fled to places which our hands cannot yet reach, to Kashmir, Banaras, and other places."<sup>122</sup> The destructive fury of the conquests of Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī destroyed the monastic universities of Odantapuri, Nalanda and Vikramasila. The Tibetan scholar Dharmasvāmīn (Chag-lo-tsa-ba) in the early part of the 13th century found no trace of the Vikramasila university. It was levelled down to the ground and the stones of the building were thrown into the river Ganges. He mentions another wave of invasion on Nalanda, Gaya and Vaiśālī sometime round about 1220 A.D. in the reign of Sultan Iltutmish.<sup>123</sup> Scholars like Śākyaśrī of the Vikramasila had to flee away. Tāranātha<sup>124</sup> relates the story of the migration of these scholars in the wake of the invasion of Bakhtiyār Khaljī. He says that Śākyaśrī fled to Jagaddala which was located in Odivisa or Orissa and three years later went to Tibet. Amongst the other teachers of the Vikramasila Uni-



versity, Buddhasrimitra and Vajraśrī went to South India, Ratnarakṣita to Nepal, Jñānakaragupta and other 100 *paṇḍitas* to south-west India, Saṅgamaśrījñāna, Raviśrībhadrā, Chandrākaragupta, 16 *mahantas* and 200 junior *paṇḍitas* went further east to Rakhan Munan, Kamboja and other countries. The emigration of the Buddhist scholars to Nepal, Tibet and the countries to the east of Kāmarūpa and Tipperah known as Koki-lands, account for the scholastic activities in these countries in the thirteenth century. Magadha suffered a heavy loss. The Turko-Afghans raised a fortress on the site of the Odantavihāra. Hence Tāranātha laments, "In Magadha the doctrine was as good as extinguished. Though there were many people learned and devoted to *siddhis* at that time, there was no means to apply them to the welfare of beings.....only Naṭeśvara's little school remained in the Buddhist doctrine."<sup>125</sup>

### *Rebuilding of Nalanda :*

But Indians and foreigners again rebuilt the educational institutions. Nalanda's history did not come to "a sudden and tragic end", as has been held by Prof. N. N. Das Gupta,<sup>126</sup> with the invasions of the Turko-Afghans. The famous monastic establishment had been damaged by fire at an earlier period. It had been repaired by Bālāditya, a Mahāyāna Buddhist hailing from Kausambi in the eleventh year of Mahipāla I.<sup>127</sup> The accounts of Dharmasvāmin clearly state that even after the destruction by soldiers of Bakhtyār Khaljī, there were eighty *vihāras*. When the invaders left, scholars and teachers again gathered in the precincts of the University. Dharmasvāmin visited the Nalanda University after its first destruction by the Turko-Afghans. He studied under Rāhulaśrībhadrā. During his stay at this university, he himself saw another invasion.<sup>128</sup> It also did not bring an end to the institution. The Tibetan chronicler Pag Sam Jon Zang informs us that a monk named Mudita-bhadrā and a Magadhan King Kukkuṭasiddhi built temples

and monasteries in the same area.<sup>129</sup> It is quite likely that it was at the new Nalanda *mahāvihāra* that the son of a ruler of Magadha named Dhyānabhadra studied for a number of years under Vinayabhadra (Lu-Hsien) in the early part of the fourteenth century. The name and history of this Indian priest Dhyānabhadra, who subsequently preached Buddhism in the Inner Palace of the Mongolian Emperor of China, appears in a memorial inscription raised by his disciple, and now preserved in the Korean temple Kuei-yen-ssu (Juniper Rock temple).<sup>130</sup>

Nowhere in the mediaeval world was it considered the duty of the State to promote education amongst citizens under the direct agency of the government. To this rule India proved no exception. But it must be said to the credit of the princes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries that they continued to make liberal contributions for the support of the *Mathas*, monasteries and individual Brāhmaṇas whose duty it was to carry aloft the torch of learning. The traditional system of providing food and shelter to the students both in the monastic institutions and in the thatched cottage of the *Guru* also continued uninterrupted. Of course, the *Guru* expected his Brāhmaṇa pupil to earn his food by begging. The villagers were liberal enough to support them by giving alms. The richer classes considered it their privilege to invite the teacher and his pupils on all ceremonial occasions, and to give them handsome presents.

Though Kṣemendra in his *Deśopadeśa* satirises the Gaudīya students and charges them with drinking wine and visiting houses of ill fame, it is difficult to believe that they received so much in presents at invitations that they could indulge in luxuries of fashionable dress and at the same time afford to pay the price of intoxicants and fees for public women. There was no postal money order system in those days and certainly the Gaudīya students did not dare to travel to Kashmir with a lot of money with them. As a matter of fact, the life of the students was a hard one. He had to

commit to memory most of the books he studied. He had to copy out the books and commentaries with his own hand. Aparārka in explaining Yājñavalkya (III. 267-268) condemns the selling of books on the Vedas, Vedāṅgas, Smṛti, Itihāsa, Purāṇa, Nīṭisāstra and Pañcharātra.<sup>131</sup> They could not, therefore, purchase these books from others. The Brāhmanic education, however, was narrow in the sense that it did not emphasise the importance of turning pupils into good citizens by teaching them social or natural sciences.

### REFERENCES TO CHAPTER VI

#### *(The Educational System)*

- 1 Śukranīṭisāra (ed. Sarkar) IV. 3
- 2 Manu IX. 329-332
- 3 Dānakāṇḍa, pp. 208-209
- 4 Bhoja's Rājamārtanḍa and Bhīmaparākrama quoted in Vīramitrodaya, Sanskāraprakāśa, pp. 322, 325
- 5 Sm. C. pp. 66-67
- 6 Sm. C. I. 26 and Aparārka on Yāj. I. 131
- 7 Sm. C. I. 29; Brahmachāri p. 263
- 8 Brahmachāri pp. 271-74
- 9 Brahmachāri pp. 115-124, 146-184, 229-239. Sachau, II. 131.
- Cf. Struggle for Empire pp. 508-509. Mookerji: Ancient Indian Education (2nd. ed.) pp. 183-187
- 10 Brahmachāri, pp. 266-67
- 11 Sachau I. 125
- 12 Brāhmaṇasarvasva p. 3A quoted in Our Heritage, Vol. I. Pt. II. p. 144
- 13 Pākayajñavivṛiti printed in Introduction to Laṅgākshigrihyasūtra (Kashmir Sans. series) p. 8
- 14 Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva p. 38 quoted by Durgamohan Bhattacharya in Our Heritage, Vol. I. (1953) p. 147
- 15 Dānakāṇḍa pp. 207, 213; Sachau I. 125
- 16 Sachau I. 127
- 17 Brahmachāri, pp. 257-259
- 18 EI. XIX. 299 (Rewah inscr.)
- 19 Gauḍalekhamālā p. 112 verse 3 of Kṛṣṇadvārikā temple inscr.
- 20 IA. XI. 102
- 21 Struggle for Empire, pp. 319-20
- 22 Kane in J. Or. R. I. Vol. XXIII, pp. 94-127
- 23 DV. Canto XV

- 24 JRAS (N. S.) Vol. I. p. 414
- 25 IHQ. Vol. XXII. pp. 131-139
- 26 IA. XVI. p. 65, verse 14
- 27 Ibid. IV. 267
- 28 EI. XXI. 1. 164 (Kharod inscr. KS. 933/1181-82 A.D. verse
- 26 Chāṇakya-vidyāmātim)
- 29 IHQ. XVI. p. 572 (Verse 27 of the Viruddha-vidhi-vidhāṃsa)
- 30 Rāj. Ch. XI. p. 99
- 31 Mānasollāsa Ch. III. 1283-1303 (GOS. ed. Vol. LXXXIV pp. 110-112). Also discussed in Struggle for Empire, p. 510.
- 32 Agni Purāṇa (ed. Cal.) Ch. 225. 1.; Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra II. 5-6.
- 33 Age of Imperial Kanauj, pp. 366-67; Struggle for Empire, p. 509 views based on Vijñāneśvara, Aparārka and Smṛtichandrikā.
- 34 Brahmachāri, pp. 199-201, 210-227, 240-243 etc.
- 35 Ibid. p. 240
- 36 Ibid p. 242 quoting Manu II. 114
- 37 Ibid. p. 234
- 38 Ibid. p. 223
- 39 Ibid. p. 227
- 40 Ibid. pp. 227-228
- 41 EI. IX. 328
- 42 Ibid. XI. 24 and IA. XVII. 62
- 43 RT. VII. 121 and VIII 246, 580, 1171-72, 2402, 2410, 2415, 2417, 2431, 3318, 3343, 3344 and 3352 respectively.
- 44 RT. VIII. 2416
- 45 EI. XXI. 99 verse 7
- 46 HB. I. 232
- 47 EI. XX. 128
- 48 IA. XVII. (1888) p. 62
- 49 EI. XXI. 97. 99
- 50 HB. I. p. 232
- 51 Spark, July 22. 1956
- 52 Majumdar, B. P.: in JBRS. Sp. issue 1956, p. 182
- 53 DHNI. VOL. I. p. 522, EI. XI. 20-26
- 54 Kathāsaritsāgara (ed. Penzer, Vol. III) Bk. VI. CH. 41. p. 93
- 55 HB. I. p. 417-418; Mookerji, R. K. : *op. cit.* pp. 589-595
- 56 IHQ. I. pp. 230, 232
- 57 DHNI. Vol. II. p. 785
- 58 Struggle for Empire, p. 420.
- 59 Mitra, R. C.: The Decline of Buddhism p. 75
- 60 Prabandhachintāmaṇi (ed. Tawney) p. 26
- 61 Samayamātrikā (ed. N. S. Press) Ch. II. verses 61-62
- 62 DHNI. II. pp. 982 and 1125
- 63 RT. VII. 214, VIII. 243, 2401, 3320-3321

64 Queens—RT. VII. 151 (Āsamatī, wife of Ananta, at Tripuresvara), 182-183 (Sūryamatī, wife of Ananta), 956 (Vasantalekhā, wife of Harṣa), VIII. 246, 374, 1052, 2309 (Jayamatī, wife of Uchchala), and 2333-34 (Ratnādevī, wife of Jayasinhha).

Princesses—RT. VII. 120. (Lothikā, dtr. of Saṁgrāmārāja)

Ministers—RT. VIII. 2408 (Rilhana), 2429 (Dhanya), 2431 (Bhutta), 3354 (Maṅkhaka), 3355-3356 and 3359 (Sumanas).

Prince Sangīya in the time of Jayasinhha RT. VIII. 3350

Others—RT. VII. 149 (Kayastha Utpala), VIII. 2420 (Udaya, the Commander-in-Chief of Jayasinhha), VIII. 2422 (Śṛṅgāra, the judge), 2423 (Alamkāra, the Superintendent of Treasury), and 2426 (Śṛṅgarabhaṭṭa).

65 JBRS XVII p. 124 (Undated Sobhanesvar inscr., possibly inscribed in the 12th century A.D.)

66 EI. II. pp. 7-17

67 RT. VII. 1010

68 Deśopadeśa, Canto VI. (p. 16 ff)

69 RT. VIII. 2423

70 Ibid. VIII. 2421

71 Cf. Vikramāṅkadevacharita, Canto XVII. 29

72 RT. VIII. 3354 and 3359

73 EI. XXVI. p. 99

74 RT. VIII. 3320

75 ET. I. p. 36

76 EI. I. 351 ff (Ranod inscr.). In IHQ. XXVI. (1050) p. 2 and 7 Mm. V. V. Mirashi identifies Mattamayūra with Kadwaha, 15 miles south of Ranod in Gwalior and Ranipadra with Ranod.

77 EI. XXV. 314 (Jubbulpur S. I. dated c. 1174 A. D.)

78 IHQ. XXVI. pp. 10-11

79 RT. VIII. 2444

80 IAHRS. Vol. IV. pp. 158ff (Malkāpuram Pl.)

81 EI. I. 357 verse 30

82 JAHRS. Vol. IV. pp. 153-154

83 Kuṭṭhanimatam verses 181-182

84 Kathāsaritsāgara Vol. II. p. 116 (Tr. Tawney)

85 Ibid. I. pp. 79 and 106

86 IA. IV. (1875) p. 268

87 Śṛīkaṇṭhacharita Canto XXV. 102

88 IB. III. p. 34 verse 20: "He is a very sage Agastya to the sea of the Bauddhas and clever in the refutation of the judgment of heretic dialecticians."

89 IHQ. XXVI. 227

90 IA. XI. 248

91 Prabhāvakacharita Canto XXI. 195

92 Prabhandhachintāmaṇi (ed. Tawney) pp. 97-103, (Singhi Jain series) pp. 66-68

- 93 Prabhāvākacharita Canto XXI. 81-251
- 94 Discussed in detail by Majumdar, A. K. in Chaulukyas of Gujarat, pp. 311-314
- 95 EI. II. p. 239 lines 44-45
- 96 MASI 1931 on Haihayas p. 134 (Rewa inscr. dated 1192 A.D.)
- 97 HB. I. 353
- 98 IHQ. XXVI. 225
- 99 Mānasollāsa (GOS Vol. LXXXIV p. 12 Viṃśati III. 1304)
- 100 RT. VII. 934
- 101 Ibid. VIII. 2395-2397
- 102 Ibid. VIII. 2397
- 103 EI. II. 227 (Vaghli SI. dated c. 1069 A.D.)
- 104 Rāj pp. 168-170
- 105 Śukranītisāra (ed. Cal. I. 369)
- 106 Kuṭṭanīmatam verse 14
- 107 EI. XIII. 283-295 (Silimpur inscr. verse 22)
- 108 IHQ. XXVI. 224
- 109 Darpadalanam (Kavyamālā series) III. Verses 7 and 42
- 110 Saṅkṛityayana, Rahula; Tibbat me Bauddha-dharma, pp. 25-30
- 111 Ibid. p. 28
- 112 Mitra, R. C. *op. cit.* pp. 45-46
- 113 IA. IX. 24 referring to Ma-twan-lin, book CCCXXXVIII fol. 14
- 114 IHQ. III. (1927) p. 148
- 115 Sankṛityayana Rahula, *op. cit.* pp. 22-23, 29
- 116 Mitra, R. C. *op. cit.* pp. 25, 72
- 117 Spark, *op. cit.*
- 118 DHNI. Vol. I. 351 (Manahali grant). EI. II. 228 (Vaghli inscr).
- 119 Darpadalanam (Kavyamālā series) Vichāra III. verses 28-50.
- 120 HB. I. 676
- 121 Sachau I. p. 152
- 122 Ibid. I. p. 22
- 123 Munshi, K. M. in Spark July 22, 1956. pp. 7 and 12
- 124 IHQ. XXVII (1951) pp. 241-246
- 125 Ibid. p. 241 Tr. Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India, Ch. XXVII by U. N. Ghoshal and N. Dutt in IHQ. XXVII. p. 241.
- 126 Struggle for Empire p. 425
- 127 JASB (NS) IV pp. 106-107
- 128 Munshi, K. M. *op. cit.*
- 129 Vidyabhusan, S. C.: Med. School of Ind. Logic p. 149
- 130 Mitra, R. C. *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48
- 131 Aparārka p. 1114

## CHAPTER VII

### Land and its Cultivation

Successive invasion of Sultān Mahmūd must have struck a heavy blow on the agriculture of Northern India. The Muslim historians have recorded only the plunder of jewels, gold and silver, but they are almost silent about the forcible seizure of the crops standing in the field or lying in the granary of the peasant. Sultān Mahmūd used to undertake his long marches in Northern India in early winter and in the spring season when the autumn and *Rabi* crops had been harvested. For example, he is known to have crossed Yamunā for proceeding to Mathura on the 2nd December, 1018 A.D. with one lakh of horses and twenty thousand foot soldiers. He did not certainly carry provisions for all these men and animals from Ghaznī for the whole of the duration of his stay in India. It was only on the occasion of his march to Somanatha through the desert route that the historians speak of soldiers being provided with food, water and forage for many days. But even on this occasion the Sultān collected fresh provisions at Nahrwal, which has been identified with Anahillapāṭaka, the capital of Gujarat.<sup>1</sup> Famine followed in the wake of the huge army and camp followers, who marched through the country-side under the leadership of Sultān Mahmūd.

But the cessation of his invasion did not offer the peasants much opportunity for pursuing their avocations peacefully. War and conquering raids by ambitious monarchs were the normal features of the age. The kings used to start their conquering march on the Vijayā Daśamī day or the tenth day of the bright half of the month of *Āśvina*, mainly because the harvesting of the autumn paddy used to take place in the bright half of this month. Lakṣmīdhara gives a poetic description of the *Navānna* festival in his

Niyatakāla Kāṇḍa.<sup>2</sup> From his account we learn that eight hundred years ago the harvesting of paddy used to take place at least a month earlier than at present in Northern India. We get an explanation of the relation between the customary time for the marching of the army and the harvesting of autumn crop in the commentary of Medhātithi who in course of expounding Manu (VII. 182) observes "when the expedition is expected to take a short time, and his force is sufficiently strong, then he may start also during the months of Phālguna and Chaitra, specially against a country which is rich in spring harvests. At this time of the year *also*, he can obtain fodder and at the same time inflict an injury upon the other party, by destroying *the crops standing in the fields*." Though the old law-givers set up the ideal of not allowing the soldiers to march through cultivated fields, yet this was seldom observed by the enemy forces. Political stability is a prime requisite for the pursuit of economic activities and especially in the cultivation of land, in which crops stand in the open for three to five months. Aparārka in explaining Yāj. II. 163 implies that no legal redress is possible for the harm caused to the crop by the horses and elephants belonging to the king and these are simply to be warded off.<sup>3</sup> Numerous inscriptions refer to the immunity of the village granted from *chāṭa* and *bhata*, which have been explained as freedom from supplying shelter, provisions and forced labour to the regular and irregular army. This shows that normally the villages consisting mostly of cultivators had to bear these heavy burdens during the movement of soldiers.

Without entering into the old controversy as to whether, the ownership of land belonged to the state or to particular individuals, we may note that land was regarded as a social trust. The State did not allow an owner to waste the valuable gift of nature. Manu<sup>4</sup> prescribes the imposition of a fine on a cultivator, who does not cultivate his field in proper time, nor guards the crop from being eaten up by animals. Similar-



ly Kauṭilya<sup>5</sup> ordains the confiscation of land from those who do not care to cultivate them. We do not know whether this dictum was responsible for the action taken by Govindachandra in 1120 A. D. in bestowing on *Thakkura* Vaśiṣṭha the village of Karaṇḍa, which had been previously given to Rudraśiva by the Kalachuri King Yaśaḥ Karṇa.<sup>6</sup> We find a similar case of confiscation in the action taken by Lakṣmaṇasena against the Brāhmaṇa Haridāsa to whom Vallālasena had given a plot of land.<sup>7</sup> The son of the author of the *Dānasāgara* was certainly aware of the sin incurred by one who resumed the land which had been gifted away previously. Aparārka quotes Bṛhaspati to say that the result of the resumption of the gift would be hell for sixty thousand years to the resumer.<sup>8</sup>

Several new features are noticeable during the period under survey. It appears that pressure on land increased, possibly due to the adoption of the profession of a farmer by people, who had earned their livelihood previously by trade and industry. The invasion of Sultān Mahmūd and the consequent loss of the major portion of the Punjab to the Turks, their subsequent raids and the interminable internecine wars of the eleventh and twelfth centuries could not but affect the trade of the country most adversely. Disturbed political condition always leads to the shrinkage of the volume of trade. If valuable markets were lost, there must have been less production in those industries, which supplied the principal commodities for trade and commerce. A considerable number of persons, therefore, had to seek their livelihood by falling back on land.

### *Irrigational projects and tanks :*

The severe economic drain, which resulted from the invasions of Sultān Mahmūd and also from the chronic warfare of the period, prevented most of the monarchs from undertaking any big irrigational project in this age. From ancient times it has been considered the duty of the king to excavate canals and tanks and provide other facilities for the supply

of water to cultivable land. But in the eleventh and twelfth centuries we do not find record of such efforts by any excepting three solitary kings, namely, Harṣa of Kashmir, Siddharāja Jayasimha Chaulukya of Gujarat and one Karṇa. Harṣa (1089-1101) excavated the big Pampā lake, which has been identified by Stein with the lagoon called now Pamba Sar.<sup>9</sup> More spectacular was the achievement of Jayasimha, who constructed the Sahasralinga lake at Anahillapura. An old inscription states that the water of the river Sarasvatī was canalised to fill up the lake with water.<sup>10</sup> The lake has been referred to by Hemachandra in his *Dvyāśrayakāvya*.<sup>11</sup> It has been mentioned in the *Kīrtikaumudī*, Maharāja Parājaya and Hammīra-Mada-Mardana.<sup>12</sup> Merutuṅga refers to the excavation of the famous Karṇasāgar lake by King Karṇa.<sup>13</sup>

The digests of this period speak very highly of the gift of tanks, wells etc. It was considered the most meritorious work to make provision for supplying water to land and its people. Accordingly we find a number of ministers and some private persons undertaking this type of work with their resources. Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, the minister of Harivarman caused the excavation of a tank before the temple of Viṣṇu in Rāḍha. The Bhuvanesvar inscription claims that "the waterless boundary lands abutting on a village situated in an arid region, has been made by him a reservoir of water which gladdens the soul and mind of the company of tourists sunk in fatigue, and whose beds of lotuses have become devoid of bees as they are fascinated by the reflections on its surface of the lotus-faces of beautiful damsels engaged in bath."<sup>14</sup> During the reign of Jayapāla of Kāmarūpa, a Brāhmaṇa named Prahāsa caused the excavation of a tank.<sup>15</sup> In Bihar, Gaṅgādhara, a counsellor of King Rudramāna caused the excavation of a tank in the Gaya district sometime before 1137 A. D.<sup>16</sup>

In Rajputana we find that tanks were constructed by Lāhinī, the sister of Purnapāla, a Paramāra ruler of Abu, probably at Vasantgaḍh, in Sirohi state, in 1042 A.D.<sup>17</sup> In

1086 A.D. Janna, a Teli Patila in the reign of the Paramāra King Udayāditya excavated a tank at Chirihitla.<sup>18</sup> Wells were constructed by the Naḍḍūla Chāhamāna King Kelhaṇa and also by Ajayasimha, a son of his feudatory chief.<sup>19</sup> In the kingdom of the Kalachuris, inscriptions refer to the excavation of several tanks by the Śaivite *āchāryas* and some feudatories. Praśāntaśiva had caused the excavation of a well, but with the passage of time it dried up. His spiritual disciple, Proboḍhaśiva not only re-excavated it, but also caused the digging up of another well. He also got excavated the Sindhu tank close to the mountain.<sup>20</sup> Rāuta-Vallāladevaka, a feudatory of Narasiṃhadeva constructed a *Vaha* water channel sometime before 1158 A.D.<sup>21</sup> Another feudatory, Malayasimha caused the excavation of a tank, in 1192 A.D., probably in Rewah, at a cost of 1500 *tankās*.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, the Tumhāna Kalachuri feudatory Brahmadeva in 1163-64 A.D.<sup>23</sup> and ministers Puruṣottama<sup>24</sup> in 1147-48 A.D. and Gaṅgādhara<sup>25</sup> in 1181-82 A.D. excavated wells and tanks in the Raipur-Bilaspur area. Gamiyaya, a minister of King Hemādrīdeva of the Berar region also excavated a deep tank and a well.<sup>26</sup> There must have been thousands of other tanks and wells excavated by private persons in the vast area of Northern India in course of the 164 years of our period, but no inscription about these has either been discovered or been written at all. But what is remarkable is the dearth of measures taken by the kings of this period to save the cultivators from the vagaries of monsoon

#### *Assessment of Land Revenue :*

The actual gross as well as net income from the sale of the produce of any particular plot of land depends on many unpredictable factors like timely rainfall, freedom from the ravages by insects and stray animals, quality of the seed sown, application of manure and the skill of the farmer. On the other hand, the rent which a plot of land had to pay was fixed for a pretty long period. It is the revenue collected from parti-

cular plots of land, which is indicated as the income per year in the Sena inscriptions.

The amount of revenue seems to have been assessed according to the fertility of the soil, location of the land and also the use to which the land was to be put. Residential land had to pay a higher rate of revenue than arable land and the land which was unfit for cultivation paid little or no rent. The Naihati grant of Vallālasena<sup>27</sup> mentions three types of land, namely *Vāstu*, *Ksetra* and *Khila*. *Vāstu* land meant the land on which residential houses could be constructed. The term *Vyābhū* found in the Mehar plate of Dāmodaradeva and the Sahitya Parisat plate of Viśvarupasena, has been explained by Niharranjan Ray<sup>28</sup>, B. M. Barua and P. C. Chakravarti<sup>29</sup> as "demarcated homestead land or residential site." But D. C. Sircar correctly interprets the word as "*Vyāmiśra bhūmi*" or mixed land consisting of *Vāstu* (homestead land), *nāla* (arable land) and *Khila* (fallow land).<sup>30</sup> In some Bengal grants *Khila* land is also called *Aprahata* land. Amarakośa and Vaijayanṭī also use the words *Khila* and *Aprahata* as synonyms. The inscriptions also refer to other types of land called *Sagartasara*,<sup>31</sup> and *Sajalasthala*.<sup>32</sup> *Garta* signifies hollow lands like pot-holes, which make the land unsuitable for cultivation. *Uṣara* means uplands which cannot be cultivated. *Sajala* means lands which are filled with water. Certain abbreviations have been used in the Mehar plate in describing the types of land. Accepting the suggestion of D. C. Sircar we may state that '*grī-tī*' indicates land containing houses and gardens, '*chā-tī*', a mound containing plantations only, '*mu-tī*', a mound or unprofitable plot or land covered with grass or jungle, and, '*chi-khi*' stands for *chira-khila*, a plot of land which has not been brought under cultivation. Analysing the various rates of revenue-income mentioned in this inscription, he comes to the conclusion that a *Drona* of land consisting of house and garden had to pay 37 $\frac{2}{3}$  Purāṇa; but if it consisted only of plantation and no residential house the rent was 30 $\frac{2}{7}$  Purāṇas for a *Drona*. If the land happened to be covered with grass

or jungle the rent was 4 Purāṇas only per *Droṇa*; but if it was arable but not actually cultivated the rent charged was a little higher, namely  $4\frac{1}{4}$  Purāṇas per *Droṇa*.<sup>33</sup>

Unless we keep in view the different categories of land, their location as well as fertility, it becomes impossible to explain how the different plots of land mentioned in the same inscription are assessed at different rates of revenue. Thus the Saktipur plate of Lakṣmaṇasena refers to 36 *Droṇas* of land yielding 250 Purāṇas in one case and another plot of 53 *Droṇas* of land assessed at the same 250 Purāṇas. Two other plots aggregating 89 *Droṇas* yielded a revenue of 500 Purāṇas.<sup>34</sup> The Naihati grant of Vallālasena indicates that 287 *Droṇas* of land paid 500 Purāṇas. In contrast to these rates the revenue of 168 Purāṇas for 191 *Khāri* of land mentioned in the Maithainagar plate seems to be absurdly low. One *Khāri*, according to Bhāskarāchārya, who flourished in the 12th century A.D., was equal to 16 *Droṇas*.<sup>35</sup> Either the land was exceptionally bad or extraordinary favourable terms must have been enjoyed by it. In contrast to this low rate, we may mention that a little more than 60 *Droṇas* of land at Betaḍḍa situated on the bank of the Ganges paid as high a revenue as 900 Purāṇas as mentioned in the Govindapur plate of Lakṣmaṇasena. The Tarpandighi grant of the same King shows that a piece of land measuring 120 *Āḍhavāpas* and 15 *Unmānas* at Velahṣṭhī in Varendrī yielded a revenue of 150 Purāṇas only. As 4 *Āḍhavāpas* or *Āḍhakas* were equal to 1 *Droṇa*, the quantity of land referred to here is a little over 30 *Droṇas* only.

In feudal economy the actual cultivator seldom pays rent directly to the Government. We have got a few definite proofs to show that there were some tillers of the soil, who had no proprietary right on land. The Ashrapur copper-plate of Devakhaḍḍa shows that a *Pāṭaka* of land was owned by Sarvāntara, but it was cultivated by peasants like Mahattara and Śikhara.<sup>36</sup> Similarly in Gujarat the Mehara King Jagamallā assigned sometime before 1207 A.D. 55 *Pāthas* of land

to three husbandmen though the ownership of the land was vested in temples. The cultivators must have received a proportion of the crop raised in lieu of their labour and management. We do not know what the actual proportion was.

#### *Cultivators :*

From the time of Kauṭilya, if not from a much earlier period, each village was peopled mostly by Śūdra cultivators.<sup>37</sup> According to the orthodox school of law-givers like Manu agriculture was one of the pursuits of the Vaiśya community, but in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the bulk of the actual tillers of soil came from the various castes who were considered to have belonged to the Śūdra community. It is highly improbable that the scholarly Brāhmaṇas, to whom land was granted by pious kings, actually (tried their hand at) ploughed the field and reaped the corn.

#### *Agricultural Products :*

As early as the days of the *Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā* the principal crops of Northern India were rice, *yava* (barley), wheat and pulses like *mudga*, *masūr* and *māṣa* and oilseeds like sesame.<sup>38</sup> Mādhavakara, the famous author of the *Nidāna*, who was born at Śilāhrada, probably in Eastern India in the ninth century A.D., has given a comprehensive idea of the different agricultural products in his *Paryāyaratnamālā*, which has been edited and published for the first time by Dr. T. P. Chowdhury in the *Patna University Journal*<sup>39</sup>. This work has been quoted many times by Sarvānanda Vandyaghaṭīya in his *Amarakoṣa* commentary which was written in 1159 A.D. In this work we come across the names of various crops like *vrihi* (rice which is harvested in the rainy season), *āśuvrihi* (a quickly ripening variety of paddy known in Bengal as *borodhān*), *jombula* or *devadhānya*, *priyaṅgu* or *kāṅgaṇī* variety of paddy, *godhūma* or wheat. Amongst pulses are mentioned *mudga* of the black as well as yellow varieties, *kalāya* (pea *chanaka*

or chick-pea), and *Kulattha* or horse-gram. Vegetables like *paṭola* or *parval* (*trichosanthes dioeca*), *Kārvellaka* or *karelā* (*momordica charantia*), *sovañjana* or *sajinū* (*moringa pterygosperma*), *helamocheka* or *hiñchā śāk* (*enhydra* or *hingchā*), *gandhātī* (*pæderia fætida*), *tumbī* (*lagenaria vulgaris* ser), *karkaṭāksha* or *knākuñra* (*cucumis utilissimus*), *kuṣmāṇḍaka* (*beninkasacerifera*), *olhā* or *ola* (*amorphophallus sampanus-latus*), *kechuka* or *kachhu* (a plant, *solocasia antiquorum*), *rājamāsha* or *barbatī* (*dolichos catjang*) and *sīmba* or *sīm* (bean) of black and white variety are mentioned. Amongst fruits we find mangoes, bananas, palm, and cocoanut. Hemachandra mentions seventeen varieties of grains as follows : *Vrihi*, *Yava*, *Masūra*, *Godhūma*, *Mudga*, *Māsha*, *Tila*, *Chanaka*, *Aṇava*, *Priyaṅgu*, *Kodrava*, *Mayushtuka*, *Śālī*, *Adhaki*, *Kulattha*, *Kalāya*, and *Śaṇa*.<sup>40</sup> It is, of course, curious to note that the great Jaina scholar has included *śaṇa* or hemp amongst *Dhānya* which term he has used as a generic expression for grains.

Another surprising matter in this connection is that Lakṣmīdhara as a strict Brāhmaṇa does not favour the taking of pulses like *mudga* and *masūra*, though both are now recognised as easily digestible and highly nutritious food. He quotes the authority of the *Brahma Purāṇa*.<sup>41</sup> Kalhaṇa considered *Mudga* as a good food for poor people.<sup>42</sup>

We have got inscriptional evidence to show that wheat was cultivated in the Gwalior area.<sup>43</sup> From the numerous references in Lakṣmīdhara's *Niyata Kālakāṇḍa* to wheat as an offering to the gods and Brāhmaṇas during festivals we may reasonably conclude that the peasants of the Uttara Pradesh used to cultivate wheat in the twelfth century. As a matter of fact, Lakṣmīdhara prescribes the cultivation of wheat for offering food to the gods on the ninth day of the bright half of Bhādra.<sup>44</sup>

Barley was widely cultivated in all parts of Northern India from very early times. Inscriptions of Rajputana refer to its cultivation.<sup>45</sup> A poem quoted in the *Saduktikarṇāmrta* states

that the hairs of the barley corn growing in the fields were as delightfully green as the blue lotus growing in the pond at the boundary of the village.<sup>46</sup> In Kashmir, a festival was observed on the day on which barley became ripe.<sup>47</sup>

Similarly, Lakṣmīdhara mentions another festival which was held on the full moon day of Vaiśākha to commemorate the creation of *Tila* or sesamum by God.<sup>48</sup>

The chief crop, however, throughout Northern India was paddy of different varieties. The well-being of the masses depended largely on the success of its cultivation. Kalhaṇa describes the snowfall which led to the destruction of the rice crop in autumn as "the grim laughter of Death bent on the destruction of all beings". He pathetically observes: "There sank (and perished) the rice crop together with the people's hope of existence."<sup>49</sup> With a good harvest the price of a *khāri* of rice was 200 *Dinnāras*<sup>50</sup>, but in years of scarcity or famine the price rose as high as 500 *Dinnāras*,<sup>51</sup> as it actually did in 1099-1100 A.D. Anulia grant informs us that the *Śālī* rice was produced in large quantity in Bengal in the lands donated to the Brāhmaṇas.<sup>52</sup> Sandhyākaranandī writes that on account of the presence of Lakṣmī whose lovely form was beheld in the paddy plants of various kinds, Varendrī became the "sparkling crest-jewel of the earth".<sup>53</sup> Non-Bengali writers, however, are silent over the quality of the rice grown in Varendrī. Aparārka cites Magadha as a country rich in rice.<sup>54</sup> *Mānasollāsa* speaks very highly of the virtues of the rice grown in Kalinga.<sup>55</sup> Hemachandra notes that when the harvest time approached the cultivator's wives in Gujarat guarded the rice-crops and sang songs during their vigils.<sup>56</sup> Some of the poems quoted in the *Saduktikarnāmaṇṭa* describe the jubilation of the peasants when there was a good harvest.<sup>57</sup>

Amongst commercial crops sugarcane and cotton were the most important. Cotton plants were grown in Bengal as well as in Central and Western India. The *Charyāpadas* of Śabarapāda and Śāntipāda refer to Karpāsa. The Charkhari



plate of Paramardī and the Augasi plate of Madanavarman also mention it. The cultivation of sugarcane is referred to in the inscriptions of Central India<sup>58</sup> and Rajputana.<sup>59</sup> Kalhaṇa refers to its cultivation in Kashmir.<sup>60</sup> *Paryāyaratna-mālā* particularly mentions the Paundra variety of sugarcane. Reference to its cultivation in Bengal are found in the *Kālaviveka*<sup>61</sup>, *Rāmacharita*<sup>62</sup> and *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*<sup>63</sup>. It is rather surprising to find that nowhere in the inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavālas is there any reference to sugarcane cultivation, though Uttar Pradesh is now the most important sugar-producing state.

Contemporary inscriptions frequently refer to the betel-leaves<sup>64</sup> and betel nuts<sup>65</sup>. References occur in inscriptions also to the fruits like cocoanut<sup>66</sup>, palm<sup>67</sup>, mango<sup>68</sup>, bread-fruit (panasa)<sup>69</sup>, pomegranate<sup>70</sup>, date<sup>71</sup>, figs<sup>72</sup> and *bassia latifolia* (Madhuka)<sup>73</sup>.

There are good reasons to believe that the North Indians in the eleventh and twelfth centuries paid greater attention to balanced diet than what is done in the present age. They insisted on having larger pasture land attached to each and every village. Cows and buffaloes could graze there either freely or on payment of a small annual fee. People in their senseless efforts to produce more cereals did not encroach on pasture land, nor did they wantonly destroy forests.

## REFERENCES TO CHAPTER VII

### (Land and its cultivation)

- 1 *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 8-21.
- 2 Nityata, p. 405; *Kṛtyaratnākara*, p. 363.
- 3 *Aparārka* (Ānandāśrama), p. 771.
- 4 *Manu*, VIII. 243.
- 5 *Kauṭilya*, II. 1.
- 6 DHNI. Vol. I, p. 519 (Bengal As. Soc. grant).
- 7 EI. XXI, p. 212 (Saktipur grant).
- 8 *Aparārka*, pp. 579-580.
- 9 RT. VII. 940.

- 10 *Annual Report Baroda State*, 1934-35, p. 18.
- 11 DV. Canto XV. 120-121.
- 12 PIHC (Calcutta) 1939, p. 479.
- 13 *Prabandhachintān.aṇi* (ed. Tawney) p. 78 and *Rūs. Mālā* I. 104.
- 14 IB. III, p. 40.
- 15 EI. XIII. pp. 283-295.
- 16 EI. II, p. 338.
- 17 *Ibid.* IX, p. 15.
- 18 *Rea: Glories of Marwar*, p. 224.
- 19 DHNI. II, p. 1119.
- 20 EI. XXI, p. 150.
- 21 IA. XVIII, p. 213.
- 22 EI. XIX, pp. 298-299.
- 23 EI. XXVI, p. 262.
- 24 *Ibid.* XXVII, p. 283.
- 25 *Ibid.* XXI, p. 164.
- 26 *Ibid.* XXI, p. 132.
- 27 EI. XIV, pp. 156-163.
- 28 Ray, N.: *Vāṅgālīr Itihāsa*, p. 223.
- 29 EI. XXVII, pp. 182-191.
- 30 *Ibid.* XXX, p. 56.
- 31 EI. XXI. 96 ; IA. XIX. 252 & XVI. 203 ; JUPHS XIV. 72.
- 32 EI. XXI. 96. ; IA. XVI. 203 & XIX. 252 ; JUPHS XIV. 72.
- 33 EI. XXX. (1953), pp. 56-57.
- 34 *Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā* 1939, pp. 87-88.
- 35 *Līlāvati* (ed. H. C. Banerjee, 1893), p. 2.
- 36 MASB. I, pp. 85 ff.
- 37 Kauṭilya II. 1.
- 38 *Vājasaneyī Samhitā*. 18. 12.
- 39 *Patna University Journal*, Vol. II (1945-46).
- 40 *Vide* Majumdar A. K.: *op. cit.*, p. 258.
- 41 Niyata., p. 275.
- 42 RT. VII. 758.
- 43 EI. X. 57. (Bhinmal inser); EI. II. 236. (Dubkund inser).
- 44 Niyata, pp. 396-397 ; *Kṛityaratnākara*, pp. 257, 278.
- 45 EI. X. 50 & XIV. 303.
- 46 Sadukti. II. 136. 5.
- 47 *Nilamata Purāṇa*, verses 696-697.
- 48 Niyata, pp. 388-89.
- 49 RT. II. 19.
- 50 *Ibid.* V. 116-117.
- 51 *Ibid.* VII. 1220.
- 52 IB. III. 85-86.
- 53 RC. III. 17
- 54 Aparārka on Yāj. I. 212 ; also quoted in *Struggle for Empire* p. 528.

- 55 *Mānasollāsa*, Virṣati III. 1347.
- 56 IA. IV. 74.
- 57 Sadukti. II. 84. 3 ; II. 176. 3.
- 58 EI. XX. 131 ; IA. XVI. 208.
- 59 EI. XIV. 300.
- 60 RT. II. 60 & VII. 1574.
- 61 KV. (BI ed) p. 411.
- 62 RC. III. 17.
- 63 Sadukti. II. 84. 3.
- 64 Baṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣat grant of Viśvarūpasena ; Lingarāja Temple inscr. (JOHRS I. 301) ; Naiṣadhacharita XVI. 110 ; RT. IV 427, V. 365, VII. 544, 787, 945 and 1067.
- 65 MASB. I. 90 ; Naihati, Anulia and Govindapur grants of Senas and Belavo pl. of Bhojavarman etc.
- 66 Rampal, Naihati. Tarpaṇdighi, Govindapur grants, EI. XIV. 300 ; RC. III. 19.
- 67 IA. XVI. 124.
- 68 IA. XIV. 103, XVI. 203, 208 and EI. XX. 130-131.
- 69 Belavo pl.
- 70 IB. III. 97.
- 71 Koṭālipāḍā pl. of Dharmāditya.
- 72 IB. III. 154-156.
- 73 EI. XX. 130.

## CHAPTER VIII

### Labour

Large-scale industries under private management were conspicuous by their absence in ancient or mediaeval India. There could not, therefore, exist any organised labour force, negotiating terms of employment with the employees on a collective basis. But some of the functions of modern trade unions were discharged by the *śreṇīs*. Vijñāneśvara contrasts *pūga* with *śreṇī* by stating that the basis of the former association was residence in the same locality irrespective of castes and professions followed by the members of the *pūga*, while the *śreṇī* was definitely a vocational organisation consisting of a group of people belonging to different castes, but following the occupation of one single caste. He cites as example of *śreṇī* the association of weavers, shoe-makers and betel sellers.<sup>1</sup>

The Government had to employ a large number of artisans of various categories for their civil and military departments. *Sukranītisūtra* gives an idea of the types of employees, who are considered highly useful. Such classes included persons who manufactured lighter machines, arrows, swords, other arms and weapons like bows and quivers and various tools and equipments necessary for the army.<sup>2</sup> Amongst the employees of the civil department were persons who could construct forts, parks, artificial forests and pleasure gardens.<sup>3</sup> Artificial forests were probably used for pleasure as well as for fighting Kūṭa-Yuddha for misleading the enemy. Carpenters, builders of chariots, blacksmiths, coppersmiths, weavers, tailors and other artisans are specifically mentioned as those whom the king had to appoint to their proper work. The king could not maintain either a big retinue in the court or undertake any military expedition without a large number

of such employees. The invasions of Sultān Mahmud and several subsequent Turkish raids as well as the increase in the tempo of internecine warfare raised the volume of demand for the labour of the artisans.

The normal feature of social life was immobility of labour from one profession to another. A person born to a professional caste habitually stuck to it throughout his life. But there were many exceptional cases in which we find talented people changing their profession. Whatever might have been the magnitude of the volume of such changes, there is no doubt that the increase in the demand for the labour of one type by the Government contributed to the betterment of the condition of service under private persons.

Private employers belonged either to the category of farmers, traders, artisans or owners of big herds of cow. Both Kauṭilya<sup>4</sup> and Yājñavalkya<sup>5</sup> provide that the agent or employee of a trader, cowherd and husbandman should receive ten per cent. of the profit of the milk and of crops respectively as his share. This payment was considered rather low in the twelfth century. Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa in his *Smṛti-Chandrikā* observes that a ten per cent. share may be given to an agricultural labourer if the crop can be raised easily without much labour. He further states that if the employer provided him with food and clothing the share to which he is entitled is twenty per cent. In case food and clothing are not provided, that is, if the agricultural labourer or the employee of the trader and manufacturer live independently in a separate establishment, one-third ( $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent.) of the produce in the case of crops raised and of the profit in other cases should be given to the employee. This indicates a distinct improvement in the status of labour. This is further supported by the most enlightened rules laid down in the *Śukranītisāra*. No labour leader of modern days can outbid the author of this book in his sympathy for the labourers. As a general principle he lays down that the rate of wages should be so fixed as to enable the worker to maintain those

who are his compulsory charges. He further observes that "those servants who get low wages are enemies (to the employer) by nature".<sup>6</sup> The writer prescribes paid holiday for fifteen days in the year. He makes provision for medical leave, pension and workman's compensation. Leave on medical grounds with full pay is allowed for a week in general cases, but a highly qualified worker should get leave for unspecified period on half pay. If a servant has been ill for a long time he should get not more than three months' wages. As regards pension it is provided that one would be entitled to half the wages only if he has spent a period of forty years continuously in service. Not only was this pension to be paid during the old age of the worker but also to be remitted to his son so long as he was a minor or to his wife and unmarried daughters, provided they were well-behaved.<sup>7</sup> There is provision for bonus also. "The king should give the servant one-eighth of the salary by way of reward every year, and if his work has been done with exceptional ability one-eighth of the service rendered."<sup>8</sup> If the worker happened to die in course of performance of his duty, his minor son was to be given the same pay as he used to earn; if the son was capable of earning his livelihood, then employment should be provided for him on a rate of pay suited to his qualification.<sup>9</sup>

The author of the *Śukranītisāra* envisages a sort of Workmen's Insurance Scheme when he advises the king to "keep with him (as deposit) one-sixth or one-fourth of the servant's wages, and pay half of that amount or the whole of it in two or three years".<sup>10</sup> This provision might have also been made as a measure of security against negligence or betrayal by the employee.

Commenting on Manu VII. 126 Medhātithi writes that besides a *droṇa* weight of grains every month and clothing every six months, an ordinary servant was to be paid wages at the rate of one *paṇa* per month. We have got no definite information regarding the actual rates of money wages

in different parts of Northern India during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

The old law-givers like Nārada classified Brāhmaṇa pupils studying the Vedas at the residence of the Preceptor, apprentices or *antevāsins* receiving instructions from some artisans or artists, hired servants and supervisor of hired servants, all as *Karmakāras*. The disciple had to perform many services for his teacher relating to the craft which he was learning, according to the orders of his master without any remuneration, but he was entitled to free board and lodging during the whole of the period of his learning, the length of which, however depended on the terms of his contract. None of these *Karmakāras* could be asked to perform any ignoble or impure service, a list of which has been drawn by *Kātyāyana*<sup>11</sup> and quoted by *Chañḍeśvara*<sup>12</sup>. The list includes performance of work like sweeping roads and doors of houses, collecting and throwing away the leavings of food etc. Such work was probably considered fit only for slaves.

### *Slavery :*

The *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya and the *Smṛtis*<sup>13</sup> refer to the institution of slavery in ancient India. The practice of keeping slaves continued down to our period. Aparārka and Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa<sup>14</sup> quoting *Kātyāyana* clearly distinguish between a hired servant and slave. Both of them hold that a Brāhmaṇa on no account could be reduced to the status of a slave. Sultān Mahmūd, however, in carrying thousands of persons as slaves to Ghaznī did not certainly make any distinction between a Brāhmaṇa and a Śūdra. The conditions for slavery have been laid down by *Jimūtavāhana*.<sup>15</sup> One who was without food and clothes could sell himself as a slave by a written document to the effect that he would serve his master. During famines, which were not infrequent in this period, many persons sold themselves as slaves with a view to saving their life. Nārada prescribes that such a person can purchase his freedom by giving a pair

of cows. It is difficult to find out how a slave, whose master was entitled to all his earnings, could procure a pair of cows.

The existence of slavery as known from the *nibandhas* can be corroborated by literary evidence. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* tells us of the story of the redemption of four merchants from slavery on payment of fees.<sup>16</sup> Female slaves are also mentioned in the digests and the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. The views of Kātyāyana that an independent woman on being married to a slave also became a slave and had to serve her husband's master, has been quoted with approval by Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa.<sup>17</sup> The *Kathāsaritsāgara*<sup>18</sup> tells us of slave-girls married to hired-servants and to Brāhmaṇas. In the same book of stories we read the story of a merchant of Pāṭalīputra, employing slaves. Jīmūtavāhana opines that if a female slave is inherited by a number of persons, she should serve all the shareholders by turns (of several days).<sup>19</sup> It is interesting to note that the Tilotha image inscription records the pilgrimage of as many as five female slaves, named, Ladumā, Nayakāmā, Ālhi, Puttrikī and Ekalī, to the Tutrāhi falls in Sahabad in the company of their master Nāyaka Prātāpadhavalā.<sup>20</sup> These slaves must have been treated affectionately by their master, otherwise their names would not have been inscribed at the foot of the image. The Lekhāpaddhati records four documents, dated V.S. 1288 on female slaves in Maharastra and Gujaraṭ regions.<sup>21</sup> These slaves had to perform many duties, such as cutting (vegetables), pulverizing (spices), washing the floor, sweeping, bringing fuel, water etc., milching the cow, buffalo, and goat, churning the curd, weeding out the grass, threshing grains, and also other domestic duties like cooking, cleaning the gutters etc. Some of these duties are also mentioned in Hemachandra's *Triṣaṭṭiśālākā-puruṣācharita*.<sup>22</sup> Any dereliction of these duties or non-adherence to the orders of the owner of the slave, was dealt with severely. The punishment, which was to be given for violation of duty, was also proclaimed in public before the agreement of slavery was entered into.\*



*Forced Labour :*

An increase in the demand for labour mitigated the hardship of those who were forced to render service to the state without remuneration. The practice of levying labour-tax was prevalent in India from very early times.<sup>23</sup> The practice attracted the notice of Megasthenes.<sup>24</sup> Manu prescribes it as a regular levy<sup>25</sup> of one day's labour per month from mechanics, artisans, and Śūdras. He does not, however, mention whether the workers are to be given food on the day of work. The Gupta monarchs used to levy it as they are known to have recorded it in their inscriptions.<sup>26</sup> The *Agni Purāṇa* definitely lays down that the king must provide food to those from whom forced labour was to be taken.<sup>27</sup> Lakṣmīdhara quotes with approval the views of Gautama who has prescribed the supply of food to the workers. This shows that at least in the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom the practice of supplying food was followed. Lakṣmīdhara cites the example

\* The most interesting deed Svayam-āgatā-dāsi-patravidhi is the declaration of Sampuri...a girl of ten years, before becoming the slave of Chāhaḍa, which is as follows : "If I, so long as I live, while employed as a slave in your house or in any other house, commit theft, seeing a vacant room appropriate some article, or finding that begging had become easier go elsewhere or mix with cheats, rascals or your enemies, or in my youth being tempted by some men leave you, then on the strength of this deed you will catch me by my hairs, bind me and again set me to work as a slave. I shall always throughout the night and day carry out the orders of your relatives. If ever, out of wickedness, I refuse to perform my duty, when ordered to do so, then you will punish me by kicking and beating with sticks and (may even) torture (me) to death, (for which) you my lord will remain as free from guilt as if you had been absent. I declare to all that should I die under torture (above-mentioned) it will have been brought about by my own fault, and you and your family shall be absolved by bathing in the Ganges. If ever I commit suicide by jumping into a well or pond or by taking poison on account of pregnancy (udarabāḍha) you my lord will be guiltless, and will only (have to perform the penance of) bathing in the Ganges." (Translation of the passage in Majumdar: *Chaulukyas*, p. 347) The reference to the capture of truant slaves by catching hold of their hair explains the famous song by the 16th century poet Govindadāsa in which the Gopīs tell Kṛṣṇa that he has brought them to the Rāsa as one brings slaves by catching hold of their hair.

of blacksmiths, porters, boatmen, owners of carriages, actors and dancers as persons who were liable to pay the labour-tax once a month. We can understand the need of compelling boatmen and owners of carts to carry heavy loads from one place to another in the absence of regular transport service. The king very often collected a proportion of the crops raised by cultivators as his share by way of tax. It would have been extremely difficult and costly to send royal share of the crops. Very strict supervision, however, was needed to see that the grains were not pilfered on the way. But the levy of forced labour of artisans like blacksmiths for one day per month was not likely to secure for the Government any complicated piece of work, which required more than one day's labour to complete it. Efficiency in production could not be expected from those who were compelled to work without payment. Such a system was detrimental to the larger interests of the community. The requisitioning of the services of actors and dancers was meant for arranging free amusement to the local officers of the king. It was certainly not a practical proposition to bring all the actors and dancers in the kingdom to the capital for the benefit of the king.

The technical term for the labour-tax was "*Viṣṭi*" and Lakṣmidhara explains it as *Valātkāreṇa ākriṣṭa Karmakāḥ*: labour forcibly recruited. During the movement of the army people were forced to carry loads, make roads, and render many other types of miscellaneous service.<sup>28</sup> Under such circumstances life was not an easy one for the common people. Kalhaṇa observes that during the reign of Jayasīṃha the villagers in spite of their wailings were forced to carry loads at the command of the commissariat.<sup>29</sup> Sometimes on the orders of the autocratic authority respectable people like the Brāhmaṇas following priestly profession were compelled to carry loads on their head, as we find in the reign of Harṣa in Kashmir. The priests, however, had recourse to hunger strike on a mass scale as a protest against such orders. The king had to withdraw them.<sup>30</sup>

The rise in the demand for labour was probably responsible

for making the author of *Sukranītisāra* recommend that "the King should make the artists and artisans work one day in the fortnight" instead of the customary one day in the month.<sup>31</sup> He further prescribes that prisoners as well as those who are accused (of serious crimes) should be set to repair the road. He goes so far as to declare that those who forsake their parents and wife should be put in chains and made to repair the road. The use of convict labour for road-making was prevalent down to the early part of the nineteenth century, but as it was found inefficient, hired labour was substituted.

## REFERENCES TO CHAPTER VIII

### Labour

- 1 Mit. on Yāj II. 30.
- 2 *Sukranītisāra* II. 196 (ed. Cal.).
- 3 *Ibid.* II. 194.
- 4 *Kauṭilya* III. 13.
- 5 Yāj. II. 194.
- 6 *Sukranītisāra* II. 397-400 (ed. Cal.).
- 7 *Ibid.* II. 409-410 (ed. Cal.).
- 8 *Ibid.* II. 412.
- 9 *Ibid.* II. 413.
- 10 *Ibid.* II. 414.
- 11 *Kātyāyana* (ed. Kane) 720.
- 12 *Vivādaratnākara*, p. 144.
- 13 Kane: *Hist. of Dharmasāstra*, II, pp. 180-189.
- 14 *Aparārka*, p. 788 and *Smṛti-Chandrikā* II, p. 197 quoting *Kātyāyana* 715.
- 15 *Vyavahāra-mātrikā*, p. 337.
- 16 *Kathāsaritsāgara* I. (ed. Tawney), p. 92.
- 17 *Smṛtichandrikā* II 201.
- 18 *Kathāsaritsāgara* I (Penzer's Ed.), pp. 240, 261, 307.
- 19 *Dāyabhāga*, Verse 7 (ed. C. Smritibhusana, p. 13.)
- 20 EI. XX, 249.
- 21 *Lekhāpaddhati* 44-47 as quoted by A. K. Majumdar in his *Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, pp. 152, 345-349.
- 22 *Triṣaṣṭīśālākā* III. 248.

- 23 Kautilya II. i; VIII. I.
- 24 Megasthenes as quoted by Arrian, Indica XII.
- 25 Manu VII. 1384.
- 26 Gupta Ins. 38, 39, 58 and Girnar Inscr.
- 27 Agni Purāṇa, Ch. 223.
- 28 Rājadharmakāṇḍa, pp. 93-95.
- 29 RT. VIII. 2513.
- 30 Śukranītisāra, IV. 2. 121 (ed. Cal.), ed. Sarkar IV. 2. 241.
- 31 *Ibid.* IV. I. 92.

## CHAPTER IX

### Industries and their Organisation

Literary and epigraphic records of the eleventh and twelfth centuries reveal a highly advanced stage of industrial life in Northern India. We are fortunate enough to get a more or less detailed account of many of the industries in the *Yukti-kalpataru* of Bhoja. Metallic industries are described in *Rasārṇava*, written in the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century. Some of these are referred to by Chakrapāṇidatta who flourished in Bengal in the eleventh century. The *Charyāpadas*, the poems of Jayadeva and other poets belonging to this age contain some information relating to some of the industries. The temples and sculptures of Bhubanesvara, Puri and Khajurāho bear unmistakable evidence of the advancement of industries requiring a high degree of skill. Some of the inscriptions and accounts of foreign travellers support the testimony of many of the literary works of this period. The lexicons like *Vaijayanṭī* and *Deśināmamālā* and the commentary on *Amarakoṣa* by Kṣīrasvāmin bear testimony to the existence of many industries in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

We have got no evidence, however, to show that there was any large-scale industry in this period. Numerous instances have been cited in this chapter on the localisation of various industries. Some cities, regions or countries became famous for some industries. The artisans living in that area had knowledge of superior workmanship bequeathed from father to son for generations. Experiments could also be undertaken in such an atmosphere. It is not possible to give an exhaustive account of all the crafts and industries which existed in the period under review. We shall mention only the most important of them.

*Textiles :*

The history of textile industry in India goes back to centuries before the birth of Christ. The main centres of this industry since the days of Kautilya<sup>1</sup> were Bengal, Kamarupa, Magadha, Madura, Aparanta, Kalinga, Kasi, Vatsa and Mahisa. That Bengal continued to hold its eminence is clear from the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea: "Through this (Ganges) place are brought malabathrum and Gangetic spikenard and pearls and muslins of the finest sorts which are called Gangetic."<sup>2</sup> Arab writers like Sulaiman belonging to the ninth century identify Ruhmi with Bengal where "a stuff made in this country which is not to be found elsewhere; so fine and delicate is this material that a dress made of it may be passed through a signet ring".<sup>3</sup> This also was supported by Khurdādbah of the tenth century A.D.,<sup>4</sup> Marco Polo in the 13th century<sup>5</sup> and the Chinese Ma Huan, a traveller of the 15th century<sup>6</sup>. The typical products in linen and cotton remained famous in between the times of the composition of the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Varṇaratnākara* of Jyotirīśvara, a Maithila writer of the 14th century. Referring to the *dukula* variety of linen cloth, Kautilya says that the variety produced in Lower Bengal (*Vaṅgaka*) was white and soft; that produced in North Bengal (*Pouṇḍraka*) was black and 'as soft as the surface of a gem' and the one manufactured in Kamarupa (*Suvarṇakudya*) had the "colour of a rising sun". Jyotirīśvara mentions embroidered red clothes of Bengal like *Meghaudumvara*, *Gaṅgāsāgara*, *Gaṅgora*, *Lakṣmivilāsa*, *Dvāra Vāsini* and *Sylhaṭi*.

Besides Bengal, Gujarat and Paithan were famous as centres of textile industry for centuries.<sup>7</sup> Marco Polo notes on the quality of the products of Paithan in these words: "These are the most delicate buckrams and of the highest price; in sooth they look like the tissue of spider's web. There can be no king or queen in the world but might be glad to wear them."<sup>8</sup>

These textile commodities were of many varieties, e.g., *Kṣauma*, *Dukula*, *Paṭroṇa*, *Kārpāsika* etc. *Kṣauma* according

to *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*<sup>9</sup> means a linen garment. Kṣīrasvāmin commenting on *Amarakoṣa*<sup>10</sup> explains *Kṣauma* as made of the fibre of *kṣauma*, which is explained as *Atasi* in *Amarakoṣa*<sup>11</sup> and Nandana's commentary on Manu<sup>12</sup>. Hemachandra includes *Dukula* or *Dugula* in the category of *Kṣauma*. But such an inclusion is against the evidence of Kauṭilya and Yājñavalkya. Kauṭilya<sup>13</sup> differentiates between *Dukula* and *Kṣauma*. Yājñavalkya<sup>14</sup> identifies *Kṣauma* with *Aṁśupatṭa*. *Patrorṇa*, according to *Amarakoṣa*, was "a bleached or white *Kauṣeya*" But the commentator Kṣīrasvāmin explains it as a fibre produced from the saliva of a worm on the leaves of trees. *Kārpāsika* means cotton fabrics. Hemachandra states that cotton clothes were known as *Vadara*. There were also other materials, from which people prepared dress. Woollen clothes were known as *ūrṇā* in the time of Devala. Both Devala and Vijñāneśvara mention a different variant known as *Kutapa*.<sup>15</sup> The latter clearly states that it was a blanket made of the hair of mountain-goats.

#### *Dress of the rich and the poor :*

There was a considerable difference between the dress worn by the rich and that used by the poor people. There is no doubt that *Kṣauma* cloth, *Chīnāmśuka* or gold-embroidered clothes were used by the richer sections of the community. Dāmodara Gupta tells us that Chintāmaṇi, the son of a Government official, used to wear a yellow-coloured gold embroidered cloth.<sup>16</sup> A prostitute was given a pair of *Chīnāmśuka* by one of her admirers.<sup>17</sup> The Chinese silk (*Chīnāmśuka*) was such a costly fabric that the feudatories are said to have covered the path with it for King Nala to walk on.<sup>18</sup> This type of silken cloth is also mentioned in the Amgachhi grant of Vigrahapāla III. Jayadeva's Śrī Kṛṣṇa is described to have worn a *dukula*.<sup>19</sup>

The poor section of the community used ordinary clothes. They had to satisfy themselves with cotton clothes and sometimes even with cloth made of hemp. In the *padas* of Śaba-

rapāda and Śāntipāda, there are often references to cotton plants and carding. A song composed by the former tells us that "This my third house is as open as sky. Oh ! how, beautiful cotton flowers have blossomed in my garden."<sup>20</sup> A poem of Śubhāṅka, collected in the *Saduktikarnāṃṛta*, also refers to the houses of poor Śrottriya Brāhmanas as strewn with cotton-seeds immediately after a storm.<sup>21</sup> In Kashmir poor people had to wear miserable *bhaṅga* or hemp-made garments.<sup>22</sup> Prisoners were also given such dress in jails.<sup>23</sup>

Textile manufacturers gave occupation to various classes of people. Some of them prepared not only the *dhotis* and *sārīs*, but also other items of dress such as veils or *Avagun-thana* and *Nichola* which was something similar to veil, according to the *Kārikā* of Hemachandra and Jayadeva's *Gīta-govinda*.<sup>24</sup> References are also found to head-dress or *Uṣṇīṣa*<sup>25</sup> for males, and to *Tuṣa* blanket.<sup>26</sup>

North Indians began using mosquito-nets at least as early as the time of the composition of the *Chullavagga*.<sup>27</sup> It is called *Maśaka-kuṭika* in the Buddhist texts. P. K. Gode<sup>28</sup> holds that the word *Maśakahari* on *Chatuḥṣkī* came to be used in Sanskrit lexicons from about 1000 A.D. onwards. It is in the *Vaijayanī* of Yādavaprakāśa (c. 1050 A.D.) that the earliest mention of the words is to be found.<sup>29</sup> Ajaya, the lexicographer states that it was used by the rich people only (*ed.* T. G. Shastri, p. 111, *Kāṇḍa* II. Verse 731).

### *Umbrellas :*

The making of umbrellas was also an ancient craft of India.<sup>30</sup> Its use was confined not to males only but it was also popular with women. Mahāśvetā in the *Kādamvarī* refers to a woman holding an umbrella. Pāla sculptures also show the use of umbrellas.<sup>31</sup> In the *Naiṣadhacharita* Nala is described as using a white umbrella. But the most detailed account of it is found in Bhoja's *Yuktikalpataru*.<sup>32</sup> Kings, princes, and ordinary people used different types of umbrellas. The *Viśeṣa* and *Sāmānya* or special and ordinary types were



used by kings and common people respectively. The special type was of two categories.—*Nirdaṇḍa* which could not be folded and *sadaṇḍa* which could be folded. The King is advised to use an umbrella whose stick and neck are to be made of pure wood, spokes of pure origin and both the thread and the cloth are to be of scarlet colour. The King also used another variant whose stick and neck were made of sandal wood, thread and cloth were to be pure white and this umbrella was decorated with a golden pitcher at the top. In the Kali age, the prescribed measure of the royal umbrellas was *daṇḍa* or stick of four cubits, *kilaka* of 3 *vitasti*, 40 *śalūkā* or spokes and each spoke three cubits long, cloth, double of those of spokes and *kilaka* of 6 *anḡulis*. At the time of marriage or coronation, the stick of the umbrella was to be of pure gold and the cloth was to be whiter. It was known as the *Navadaṇḍa* type. The princes of royal blood were given a different variant of umbrella. Its height was to be one-fourth less than the length of the umbrella of the King. The *Pratāpa* type used by princes had bluish cloth and stick decorated with a golden pitcher at the top. As for common people, their umbrellas were to be half of the length of that used by princes. The stick of these ordinary umbrellas were made of timber: *champaka*, *panasa*, *sāla*, *śrīphala*, *sandal*, *vakula*, *neem*, and *varjarvorna*. Iron spokes are conspicuous by their absence in all types of umbrellas.

It is interesting to note here that a copper-plate grant dated Śaka 972/c. 1050 A.D. of King Trilochanapāla of Gujarat refers to the dedication of an umbrella resplendant with gold and jewels to God Somanātha by Vatsarāja, the father of King Trilochanapāla.<sup>33</sup>

#### *Sugar :*

We have already seen that the cultivation of sugarcane was popular in Bengal, Central India, Kashmir and Rajputana. Of these, Bengal and South India led in the manufacture of sugar. Bengal produced so much sugar according to the six-

teenth century Portuguese traveller Barbosa that she competed with South India in supplying it to different parts of India, Ceylon, Arabia and Persia.<sup>34</sup>

#### *Salt :*

Contemporary inscriptions of Bengal<sup>35</sup> and Rajputana<sup>36</sup> and in the kingdoms of the Chandellas<sup>37</sup>, Gāhaḍavālas<sup>38</sup> and Kalachuris of Tripuri<sup>39</sup> refer to grant of salt-pits and the right of manufacturing salt to donees. It is difficult to state whether there was a large-scale salt manufacture in Northern India.

#### *Metals (Iron and Steel) :*

Northern India made a considerable progress in the field of metallurgy. Iron came to be used for variety of purposes during our period, specially in building temples. 'Utbi in his *Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī*<sup>40</sup> informs us that on both sides of the City of Mathura, "there were a thousand houses to which ideal temples were attached, all strengthened from top to bottom by rivets of iron." (Beams). Indian engineers also planned the manufacture of beams. About 239 beams ranging upto 17 feet long and upto 6" by 4" or 5" by 6" inches section have been used in the Gundichabāri at Puri.<sup>41</sup> Graves gives a detailed account of these beams. As many as 95 beams were fixed at the lintels of doors and 114 below the temple. Iron beams are also seen in the Bhuvaneshvar and also in the Konaraka temples. In the Konaraka temple Stirling counted 9 beams in 1824<sup>42</sup> and Graves 29 beams. Dr. R. L. Mitra noted the length of beams as 21 feet with average cross-section of 8 inches by 10 inches. But Graves found the largest beam 35 feet long and 7" to 7½" inches square weighing 6000 lbs. Percy Brown<sup>43</sup> observes that beams were forged and "the larger ones were evidently produced by welding together a number of 'blooms' of wrought iron by means of a hammer. However, this process of forging of beams seems to have been known only to Orissa."

*Crucibles :*

Crucibles, swords and water-vessels were manufactured from iron. The making of the *Jāranāya yantram* has been mentioned in the *Rasārṇava*<sup>44</sup>, written in the twelfth or thirteenth century and the *Rasaratnasamuchchaya*<sup>45</sup>. Iron crucibles were twelve digits long. Regarding the ingredients for crucibles, Vāgbhaṭa recommends that the "earth which is heavy and of a pale colour, sugar or earth from an ant-hill or earth which has been mixed with burnt husks of paddy, fibres of hemp plant, charcoal and horse-dung pounded in an iron mortar and also rust of iron, are to be recommended for crucible-making." The Edilpur plate of Keśavasena mentions water-vessels of iron.<sup>46</sup>

*Arms, spears etc :*

Weapons of war such as arrow-heads and swords have been mentioned by a host of mediaeval Muslim historians. Alberuni also refers to the makers of arrows, spear points, swords and knives in Northern India.<sup>47</sup> The author of the *Śukranītisāra* regards those who could make light machines, arrows, cannon-balls, swords, bows and quivers as useful servants of the King.<sup>48</sup>

*Swords :*

The manufacture of swords was an ancient Indian industry. 'Utbi'<sup>49</sup> says that soldiers of Brāhmaṇapāla, son of Anandapāla, used white swords, blue spears and yellow-coats of mail. White swords evidently mean the best steel sword, which when swung appeared to be only a flash of light, a radiant whiteness. Nizāmi in his *Tāj-ul-Māāsir*<sup>50</sup> also gives a vivid picture of Indian swords used by the soldiers of Gwalior. "That sword was coloured of Caerulean blue, which from its blazing lustre resembled a hundred thousand Venuses and Pleiades, and it was a well-tempered horse-shoe of fire, which with its wound exhibited the peculiarity of lighting and thunder ; and in the perfect weapon the extreme

of sharpness lay hid, like (poison in) the fangs of a serpent ; and (the water of the blade) looked like ants creeping on the surface of a diamond." The elaborate description of the process of manufacturing arms and weapons found in Sanskrit technical literature proves the truth of the statement made by Nizamī. The indigenous literature also mentions the characteristics of the swords manufactured in various parts of North India. The *Yuktikalpataru* of Bhoja states that Benares, Magadha, Nepal, Saurashtra and Kalinga had a reputation for producing swords.<sup>51</sup> But Śārṅgadhara, who flourished in the thirteenth-fourteenth century, mentions that Khaṭṭi-Khaṭṭara, Rishika, Vaṅga, Sūrpāraka, Videha, Madhyamagrāma, Chedideśa, Sahagrāma and Kālīñjar were famous centres.<sup>52</sup> Of these places, the swords manufactured at Benares, Saurashtra, Rishika, Aṅga and Kālīñjar could stand the test of time. Chau-Ju-Kua states that the double-edged swords of Bengal were very sharp.<sup>53</sup> A comparative study of the works of different periods show that some localities developed their skill in course of time, while others fell into decay. Thus according to the *Agni Purāṇa* swords made in Khaṭṭara are beautiful, Sūrpāraka swords strong, Aṅga and Vaṅga swords sharp.<sup>54</sup> In the eleventh century Bhoja, however, describes the Aṅga swords as dirty and blunt.<sup>55</sup> Śārṅgadhara's anthology of the thirteenth century speaks of Aṅga swords as famous for their sharpness, strength and excellent handles.<sup>56</sup> As the age of this particular poem is not known, its evidence cannot be accepted against the positive opinion of an expert like Bhoja. The decadence of South Bihar in the mediæval age is well-known. A reference by Bhoja to the bad type of swords produced in Aṅga illustrates the decay of an once-famous industrial area. The criterion of distinction between good and bad swords, according to Bhoja's *Yuktikalpataru* and *Nītikalpataru* ascribed to Kṣemen-dra, was the sound produced by them. The *Agni Purāṇa*, however, regards that the sword, 50 *aṅgulas* in length, producing the sound of an ornament was the best, and the best

types were those known as *Padmapalūsāgra*, *Maṇḍalāgra*, *Karaviradalāgra*, *Ghritagandhā* and *Ākōśuprabha*. The worst type was known as *Kākolūkavarṇa*.<sup>57</sup> *Śārṅgadhara*<sup>58</sup> devotes nine slokas each on good and bad swords. The sword, which on being struck produced beautiful sound, was worshipped by kings and the one which was curbed was to be thrown away.

Contemporary literature also discusses the relative qualities of iron. The *Rasendrasīrasaṅgraha* quotes a passage from the *Yuktikalpataru* on this. Bhoja puts the relative quality of the following grades of iron thus: *Krouñcha* iron two times better than *Sāmānya* iron, *Kaliṅga* as eight times better than *Krouñcha*, *Bhadrā* as hundred times better than *Kaliṅga*, *Vajra* as hundred times better than *Bhadrā*, *Paṇḍi* as hundred times better than *Vajra*, *Niraṅga* as ten times better than *Paṇḍi* and lastly, the *Kaṇṭha* iron as million times better than *Niraṅga* iron. These gradations of iron obviously refer to the pig, cast and wrought iron. But the author of the *Rasaratna-samuchchaya* was more precise in describing the characteristics of each quality of iron.<sup>59</sup> *Munda* or cast iron has been classified thus: *Mridu* or easily malleable but unbreakable and glossy, *Kuṇṭha* which expanded very little after hammering and *Kadara* which was breakable. *Tikṣṇa* or steel had the following six varieties: *Khara*, *Sara*, *Hriṇṇāla*, *Tarabhaṭṭa*, *Vajira* and *Kālalaṭha*. *Kānta* had also different varieties: *Bhrāṇṣaka* or iron which moved all other iron, *Chumvaka* and *Karṣaka*, i.e., magnetic iron, *Drāvaka*, i.e., iron which easily melted, *Romakāntā*, i.e., iron which when burnt shot hair-like filaments. These characteristics of iron and steel clearly prove that the manufacture of iron reached a high stage of development in Northern India in the period under survey. The process of purifying iron has been discussed at length by Sir P. C. Ray in his *History of Hindu Chemistry*.<sup>60</sup> The Kashmir manuscript of Vrinda (c. 900 A.D.) prescribes that iron is to be lighted first and then "macerated in the juice of the emblic myrobalan and *trewia nudiflora* and ex-

posed to the sun, and again to be macerated in the juice of certain other plants and then to be rubbed in a mortar". Chakrapāṇi of the eleventh century A.D. prescribes a better method of purification of iron. After the bar of iron is rubbed with impalpable powder, as described by Vrinda, the iron is to be heated to fusion point and plunged into the decoction of the myrobalans and roasted repeatedly in a crucible.<sup>61</sup> The *Rasaratnasamuchchaya*<sup>62</sup> informs us that if a piece of iron is rubbed with cinnabar weighing 1/20th of the weight of that iron, and lemon juice and sour gruel and roasted in a covered crucible forty times. *kāntam*, *tīkṣṇam* and *mundam* are killed. *Tīkṣṇa* iron can be powdered if it is repeatedly heated.

### Copper:

North Indians had presumably no knowledge of the copper mines of Chotanagpur and the Deccan. It was an article of export from Broach in the days of Periplus<sup>63</sup> (c. 75 A.D.) but in Marco Polo's time (c. 1293) Thanā port used to import copper.<sup>64</sup> The author of the *Rasaratnasamuchchaya* was aware only of the superior quality of copper brought from Nepal, and of the copper dug from mines in Mlechchha countries. Locations of copper are mentioned in the *Dhātunāṁjārī*, a part of the *Rudrayāmala-tantra*, probably a work composed not earlier than the fourteenth century, as Nepal, Kamarupa, Bengal, Madanesvara, Gangādvāra, that is foot of the Himalayas, the country of the Mlechchhas, Rūma, the country of the Phirangas and mountaineous regions.<sup>65</sup>

Sulphide and sulphate are two compounds of copper. Vrinda (c. 900 A.D.) says that sulphide of copper could be prepared artificially. "Sulphur, copper and the pyrites are to be pounded together with mercury and subjected to roasting in a closed crucible and the product thus obtained to be administered with honey."<sup>67</sup> Chakrapāṇi also gives us the method of preparing powder of copper-compound.<sup>68</sup>

Copper could be extracted from other materials like blue vitriol and borax<sup>69</sup> as is known from *Rasaratnasamuchchaya* (II. 133-136) which states: "Take blue vitriol and one-fourth its weight of borax and soak the mixture in the oil expressed from the seeds of *pongamia glabra* for one day only and then place it in a covered crucible and heat in the charcoal fire," *mūkshika* which has been identified by P. C. Ray with pyrites and *vimala*.<sup>70</sup> The process described in these books is similar to that of the earlier *Rasaratnākara* (II. 35-36) ascribed to Nāgārjuna. However, it is interesting to state here that according to the *Rasaratnasamuchchaya* II. 8 D, the golden pyrite was available in Kanauj.<sup>71</sup>

#### *Use of other metals :*

Like the purification of iron, other matters like sulphur, alum or *tuvari* and minerals like silver, tin, lead could also be purified.<sup>72</sup> Besides these metals, mica was pressed into service. A close study of the *Rasaratnasamuchchaya*<sup>73</sup> reveals that there were three varieties, viz. *piṇākam*, *nāga maṇḍukam* and *vajram*. The speciality of mica as known to them was that mica did not combine with mercury.

Hindu alchemists could extract zinc from calamine.<sup>74</sup> The *Rasaratnasamuchchaya*, V. 205 and 212-216 prescribes the method of preparing alloys like *Kāṁśya* (bell-metal) and *Vartaloḥam*.<sup>75</sup> "*Kāṁśya*, is made by melting together eight parts of copper and two parts of tin." "*Vartaloḥam* is produced from *Kāṁśya*, copper, *pittala* (brass), iron and lead." The Bhatera copper-plate of Govinda-keśava also mentions the name of one Govinda, who used to make bell-metal.

The purification of gold and other minerals or that of mercury was known to Indians for a long time. These were used for medical purposes. The earliest account of the chloride of mercury is to be found in the *Rasārṇava*<sup>76</sup> (c. 1000-1212 A.D.). Sir P. C. Ray writes in his *Hindu Chemistry* that "the chlorides of mercury are found to be medicinally used from the twelfth century downwards".<sup>77</sup> The Tantras

and the Nātha yogins knew and popularised the use of mercury. That mercury gave long life was not the tall claim of the Tantras alone. Foreign observers like Marco Polo believed in its efficiency. "There is another class of people called *chugi* (yogi)", writes Marco Polo, "who were indeed properly abraiman, but they form a religious order devoted to the idols. They are extremely long-lived, every one of them living to 150 or 200 years.... These people make use of a strange beverage, for they make a potion of sulphur and quicksilver mixed together, and this they drink twice every month."<sup>78</sup> The famous physician Chakrapāṇi (c. 1060 A.D.) gave due recognition to the preparation of black sulphide of mercury for cure of diseases.

### *Glass Industry :*

The use of *Kācha* or glass in India is at least as old as the age of Suśruta, who prescribed that liquids and wine should be served in glass vessels. More references to glass occur in mediæval works\* of the 12th and 13th centuries. *Rasārṇava* mentions *Kācha Kupi*, a glass bottle. The use of different types of glass-vessels are mentioned in the thirteenth century works on alchemy like *Rasaratnākara* of Nityanātha Siddha and *Rasaprakāśasudhākara* of Yasodhara.<sup>79</sup> The *Rasaratnasamuchchaya* (IX. 34-36) also mentions an apparatus of glass known as *Vālukāyantram*<sup>80</sup> which is described as follows: "A glass-flask with a long neck containing mercurials is wrapped with several folds of cloth smeared with clay and then dried in the sun."

### *Mirrors :*

But Indians did not know the method of making looking-glasses. Brass served the purpose of mirrors. Mirrors were manufactured from eight minerals.<sup>81</sup> It appears from the

\* B. K. Sarkar in his edition of the *Sukranītisūtra* wrongly translated *kṣara*, which occurs in the *Sukranītisūtra*, IV. 2. 118 (Cal. Ed.), as glass. *Kṣara* means alkali (*vide* Ray: *Hindu Chemistry*, I. 30 & 38).



*Yuktikalpataru* that mercury was also one of the ingredients. The above-mentioned book also refers to three varieties of mirrors, viz. *bhavya* which was one-*vitasti* in length, *vijaya* which was four *aṅgulaś* long and broad and *pauruṣa* on which fell the full length of a person. Even in the 17th century, when *Viranītrodaya* was composed, mirrors were made of bell-metal. India began to import foreign European glasses from 1550 A.D. onwards.<sup>82</sup> So we may safely assume that the mirrors which figure in the Pāla, Khajuraho, and Bhuvanesvar sculptures were made of brass or gem.

### *Tanning Industry :*

How old the use of footwear is in India cannot be definitely ascertained. The *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*<sup>83</sup>, *Gobhila Grihya-sūtra*<sup>84</sup> and *Mahābhārata*, *Anuśāsana Parva*<sup>85</sup> refer to it. Sculptural representations from Bengal, Bihar and other places<sup>86</sup> show the use of boots by Sūrya and Revanta. Tanning industry must have been popular as Lakṣmīdhara speaks of the association of leather workers. The *Śukranītisāra* also refers to persons working with leather as deserving of the attention of the king.<sup>87</sup> Leather was also exported in large quantities from Thānā.<sup>88</sup> Marco Polo says that dressed hide was exported to Arabia and the Persian Gulf.<sup>89</sup> Cambay was one of the centres for manufacture of sandals.<sup>90</sup> Besides shoes, other articles made were bags for carrying water and bottles for keeping oils.<sup>91</sup>

### *Boat-making industry :*

Boat-making was one of the main industries in countries like Bengal and Kashmir, which have got a net-work of rivers. The *Charyāpadas* often explain their philosophy by using the simile of boats. A *pada* of *Kaīhapāda* states that the body which is the net or Mūyā should be plied in the mid-stream, and the Pañcha Tathāgata should be made an oarsman.<sup>92</sup> Some of the *Charyāpadas* also introduce us to the method of plying boats. Incidentally the life of boatmen is presented

to us in these picturesque descriptions of the Sahajia Buddhists. Sarahapāda states: "Body is boat, pure mind is its oar, the Guru's words are helm. Fix up your mind and hold the boat, in no other way can you cross the river. The boatman carries the boat by rope; mingle yourself with *Sahaja* and do not go in any other different direction."<sup>93</sup> Kamvālamvara also describes the starting of a boat. The peg of the boat has been taken out and the rope has been spread. Oh labourer, after asking the *Sadguru*, ply the boat. He looks around; but who can ply the boat without helm? Another song composed by Bhūsukupāda, narrates that Bhūsuku after crossing the Padmā canal reached East Bengal. But Vaṅga (i.e., East Bengal) is merciless—whatever material was on the boat, everything was taken away by the dacoits.<sup>94</sup>

The *Yuktikalpataru* of Bhoja<sup>95</sup> acquaints us with all the necessary materials and characteristic qualities of types of boats. Boats are classified by him on the basis of woods used in them. They are four categories, viz. (a) light, soft and pieceable wood belonging to the Brāhmaṇical class, (b) light and yet strong and not easily pieceable to the Kṣatriya class, (c) soft and heavy as Vaiśya and (d) strong and heavy as Śūdra. Bhoja recommends that the Kṣatriya wood was the most suitable for construction of boats. Another basis of his classification is the measurement and area of boats. The ordinary types were ten in number: *kṣudrā*, *madhyamā*, *bhīmā*, *chapalā*, *pātāla*, *bhayā*, *darghā*, *patrapuṣā*, *garbharā* and *mantharā*. Of these ordinary vessels journey in *bhīmā*, *bhayā* and *garbharā* are regarded as inauspicious. Excepting *mantharā* all the above-mentioned boats could cross the ocean. Bhoja also advises that the woods of ocean-going vessels are not to be joined together with iron, because magnetic iron in the sea could lead to the capsizing of boats.

Contemporary inscriptions and literature also corroborate the statements of Bhoja. The Bhatera copper-plate refers to boats. In Bengal, during the days of Devapāla there were officers in charge of ferries called *Tarika* and *Tarapati*.<sup>96</sup>

Bengal merchants often went abroad. It is also well-known that the South Indians had intimate commercial and political contacts with South-East Asia, which could not have been possible without ships. Śrīharṣa used the term *pota* for sea-going vessels.<sup>97</sup> *Charyā* song no. 15 composed by Śāntipāda also refers to vessels entering the seas.

Other types of boats are also mentioned in the *Yuktikalpataru*. The special (*viśeṣa*) boats are classified in two categories, viz. *dirghā* and *unnatā*. The former was again classified into ten sub-classes, viz. *dirghikā*, *tarāṇī*, *lolā*, *gatvarā*, *gāminī*, *rārī*, *janghalā*, *plāvinī*, *dhārīnī* and *veginī*. Of these the use of *lolā*, *gāminī* and *plāvinī* has been regarded as troublesome. He also describes boats with cabins and without cabins. The boats with cabins are known as *sarvamandirā*, *madhyamandirā* and *agramandirā* on the basis of the position of the cabin in front, the rear or the whole of it. The first type *sarvamandirā* was used by kings and queens, the second one by the sovereign during rainy season and the third one for military expeditions.

Contemporary literature and inscriptions show the value of boats in wars. The Kamauli grant of Vaidyadeva, the commentary of the *Rāmācharita* refer to naval engagements and to the crossings of rivers by the Pāla army.<sup>98</sup> Boats were used in a military expedition of Vijayasena.<sup>99</sup> The Madanpur plate of Śrīchandra also refers to *ardhanauvāṭaka* and *nauvāṭaka*, which mean a fleet of boats and half a division of fleet.<sup>100</sup> It seems that only by the use of 1400 war-boats Sultān Mahmūd could defeat the Jats in 1026 A.D.<sup>101</sup> In Kashmir, Sujji could win the battle of Gambhīrā by erecting a boat-bridge.<sup>102</sup> Boats are essential for crossing the rivers in Kashmir. The making of boat-bridges over Vitastā is as old as the time of Pravarasena II.<sup>103</sup> The importance of boats as the ordinary means of travel in the Kashmirian valley is evident from frequent references to river journeys in the *Rājatarāṅginī*.<sup>104</sup>

It is interesting to note here that something like modern oceanic vessels with several floors and facilities like lounge,

playgrounds etc. are mentioned in Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa*<sup>105</sup> and *Śrīmad Bhāgavata*<sup>106</sup>. These are called *Nauvimāna*. Neither inscriptions nor technical literature acquaint us with such pleasure-boats. They may be poetic fancies. Dr. Radhakumud Mookerjee is the first Indian historian to draw the attention of the scholarly world to the shipping industry in ancient India.

### *Wooden furniture :*

Household commodities made of wood were, as in olden times, chairs, couch and bedsteads. The *Yuktikaipataru* mentions chairs made of metal, stone, and wood. The varieties of woods used were: *gāmbhāri*, *vanasa*, *chandana*, *bakula* trees etc. The *pīṭhas* called *śubhasaṅgaka*, *jaya*, *sukha*, *jaraka*, were used during royal coronation. Bhoja also gives detailed information about the types of planks of wood used for manufacturing the bedstead. There were eight types of bedsteads, viz. *maṅgalā*, *viṣayā*, *puṣṭi*, *kṣanā*, *tuṣṭi*, *sukhāsana*, *pracaṇḍā* and *sarvatobhadra*, each of which differed from the other in size. The *Rājatarāṅginī* mentions cotton-padded couch.<sup>107</sup>

### *Soap and soap-nuts :*

A scholarly account of the use of soap and soap-nuts in ancient and mediæval India has been given by Gode.<sup>108</sup> As early as the *Manusmṛti*<sup>109</sup> and *Yājñavalkya*<sup>110</sup> various types of woollen or silken goods were washed with *ariṣṭa* or soap-berry tree, *bel* fruit or *ūṣaḥ* and *kṣāraṇṭtikā* or saline earth. According to Ḍalhaṇa of Kashmir (c. 1100 A.D.) saline earth could be found in plenty at Badātaradeśa near Benares. *Phenaka*, a soap-like substance began to be used by men of fashion in the days of Vātsyāyana. By the time of Aparāka, the following things were used for cleaning clothes: hot water, ashes, powder of wheat, *kalāya*, *māṣa*, *masūra* and *mudga* pulses, cowdung, salt, earth, *gosakrīḍabhasma*, sand, alkaline water, *asmapragharṣaṇa* and *gomūtrakṣāra*. Silvery water was

to be used for woollen and silken garments and gold-water for *kṣauma* goods. Exposure to air, fire, moon's and sun's rays was recommended in case of costly woollen garments and also the use of soap-nuts, *iṅguda*, rice (*taṇḍula*), and mustard.<sup>111</sup>

### *Ornaments :*

Arab travellers like Sulaiman and Abu Zeid of the ninth century found men and women using gold bracelets adorned with precious stones.

Precious ear-rings and collars were worn by kings and the grandees of courts.<sup>112</sup> Describing the ornaments used by kings, Abu Zeid writes: "They (*i.e.*, the kings of the Indies) wear also collars of great price, adorned with precious stones of diverse colours, but especially green and red; yet pearls are what they most esteem; and their value surpasses that of all other jewels.... The grandees of their court, the great officers and captains wear the like jewels in their colours."<sup>113</sup> Many ornaments are referred to in the Deopara inscription of Vijayasena and the Naihati plate of Vallālasena. The former mentions jewels, necklaces, ear-rings, anklets and gold bracelets.<sup>114</sup> *Rāmācharita*<sup>115</sup>, *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣācharita*<sup>116</sup>, *Rājatarāṅgini*<sup>117</sup>, *Samayamātrikā*<sup>118</sup> and *Naisadhācharita*<sup>119</sup> describe various types of ornaments. The terracotta figures discovered at Rajghat, Baranasi show how the hairs of ladies were tied with pearl festoons.<sup>120</sup> *Ratnakunḍala* was a popular ornament in Bengal.<sup>121</sup> The Khajuraho sculptures show that *keyura*, *nūpura* and *grāivyeka* necklace were extensively used. O. C. Gangoly has shown that these sculptures demonstrate the wearing of various kinds of ornaments by females on their forehead, arms, wrists and ears.<sup>122</sup> In the *Deśināmamālā* of Hemachandra we have the names of the following ornaments : ear ornaments, rings, necklace and head ornament called *chālvāso*.<sup>123</sup> Besides these, ornaments like ullarayam made of cowries and *Tagnam*, a bracelet made of strings as used by poorer people are also mentioned by Hemachandra.<sup>124</sup>

The high degree of skill attained by jewellers is amply testified by the intricate designs manifested in the necklaces and ear-rings in Khajuraho sculptures. Pūrvaṭi and Lakṣmī wear a necklace arranged in rectangular slabs. An Apsarā with a mirror in the Kandariya Mahādeo temple wears a tyre-shaped necklace and the Flying Deva in the Dulādeo temple is seen with a necklace whose rectangular blocks are long. As regards ear ornaments, the Apsarā of the Pārśvanath temple, wears a heavy ornament, where a bud appears below the ear and below the bud a sun-flower-like ear-ring hangs. The Apsarā with a mirror in the Kālī temple has an ear-ring, which is a round pressed square-block. Another Apsarā with a scorpion in the Kandariya Mahādeo temple has an ear-ring whose flowers are entwined.

Contemporary inscriptions and literature refer to the following industries also: machinery for drawing water,<sup>125</sup> for extraction of oil,<sup>126</sup> for pressing barley,<sup>127</sup> equipments for catching fishes,<sup>128</sup> conchshell,<sup>129</sup> construction of chariots, stone-cutting, enamelling of metals, pottery,<sup>130</sup> polishing earthen, wooden, stone and metallic vessels, making of watches and musical instruments, roaps and saddles, flaying of hides, canework<sup>131</sup> dyeing of clothes,<sup>132</sup> ivory-works,<sup>133</sup> silver products<sup>134</sup> etc. The casting of metallic images was another important industry in India. Its centres, however, are not known to us. But it is certain from the findspot of images of Nalanda and Kurkihar that bronze industry was in a flourishing condition in South Bihar. Soon after the Turko-Afghan invasion, the bronze industry seems to have disappeared from the region in the thirteenth century.

#### *Organisation of Guilds :*

The artisans and craftsmen engaged in different industries generally carried on their work in their own cottages. Some of them, however, had a number of apprentices under them. These apprentices learnt the craft under the master's care and supervision. He had to provide them with food and

lodging, but no remuneration had to be paid for the output turned out by the apprentices. As all classes of people were habituated to live in joint families and as five to ten adult male members very often lived in one family, the industrial units in the eleventh and twelfth centuries need not be considered as run by one or two personally. People belonging to the same vocational caste used to reside together in a village or in a quarter of the town.

From time immemorial the artisans and craftsmen carried on their work under the control of their *śreṇīs* or corporations. Each craft or industry had its own corporations, but these bodies were local in character. There is no evidence to show that the vocational corporations or *śreṇīs* of villages were united in district councils or that the latter sent representatives to the regional or state councils. The local associations, however, in big cities or capital towns wielded considerable power.

Medhātithi commenting on Manu VIII.41 states that *śreṇīs* are formed by artisans, tradesmen, money-lenders, coach-drivers and so forth. Vijñāneśvara in explaining *Yājñavalkya* II. 30 specifically mentions the *śreṇī* of weavers, shoe-makers, betel-sellers etc. Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa also defines *śreṇīs* as guilds of craftsmen like weavers.<sup>135</sup> Alberuni states that eight classes of people, namely, the fullers, shoe-makers, jugglers, basket and shield-makers, sailors, fishermen, hunters of wild animals and birds and weavers formed guilds.<sup>136</sup> The Tailika *śreṇī* or guild of oil-pressers<sup>137</sup> and gardeners<sup>138</sup> are referred to in contemporary inscriptions.

Lakṣmīdhara<sup>139</sup>, Aparārka<sup>140</sup> and Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa<sup>141</sup> all quote a passage of Bṛhaspati which states that the *śreṇīs*, as well as *gaṇas* and village associations, may make certain agreements which must be binding on all the members. The old law-givers like Yājñavalkya and Nārada lay down that it is the duty of the king to prevent the breach of conventions of *śreṇī*, *pūga*, *naigama* etc.<sup>142</sup> These clearly show that the guilds had some power to make laws relating to the

conduct of their business. They had also some judicial powers. Aparārka quotes Bṛihaspati to show that the heads of guilds may reprimand and condemn wrong-doers and may also excommunicate them.<sup>143</sup> It is, however, stipulated in the *Śukranītisāra* that cases of theft and robbery are to be decided by the king alone and not by the guilds.<sup>144</sup>

The *Smṛtichandrikā* declares that when *sanxīhas* like *śreṇīs* fail to decide cases unanimously, they should appoint an executive committee consisting of two, three or five *kāya-chintakas* and *hitavādins*.<sup>145</sup> The heads of important guilds commanded great authority and respect. The Deopara inscription states that Śūlapāṇi who was the head of the artisans of Varendra (North Bengal), received from the king the title of *Rāṇaka*.<sup>146</sup>

#### REFERENCES TO CHAPTER IX

(Industries and their Organisation)

- 1 *Kauṭilya*, II. 2.
- 2 *Periplus* (ed. Schoff), p. 47.
- 3 *HIED*, I. 361.
- 4 *Ibid.*, I. 14.
- 5 *Marco Polo* (ed. Yule, II. 115).
- 6 *JRAS* 1895, pp. 531-32.
- 7 *Periplus*, pp. 34, 42, 43.
- 8 *Marco Polo*, II. 391.
- 9 *Maitrāyaṇi Saṁhitā*, III. 6. 7.
- 10 *Kṣīrasvāmin's Com.*, II. 6. 113.
- 11 *Amarakoṣa*, II. 9. 20.
- 12 *Nandan's Commentary on Manu*, II, 41.
- 13 *Kauṭilya*, II. 2.
- 14 *Yāj.*, II. 6.
- 15 *Amarakoṣa*, II. VI. 3. 14.
- 16 *Kuṭṭānīmatam* (ed. T. Ray), verse 66, p. 12.
- 17 *Ibid.*, verse 344, p. 62.
- 18 *Naiṣadhacharita*, XXI. 2.
- 19 *Gītagovinda*, I. 44 ; II. 12.
- 20 *Charyāpada* (ed. Sen), No. 50.
- 21 *Sadukti.*, III. 17. 2.
- 22 *RT*, VII. 300.
- 23 *RT*, VIII. 93.
- 24 *Gītagovinda*, V. 11.



- 25 *Medinīkoṣa*.
- 26 *Samayamātrikā*, 8. 124.
- 27 *Chullavagga* (ed. Rhys Davids), V. 13. 3.
- 28 *Bhāraṭīya Vidyā*, VII, pp. 279-288.
- 29 *Vaijayanī* (ed. Oppert), p. 168.
- 30 *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* XX, 45. 23. *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, 72. 922-924.
- 31 Kramrisch, S: *Pāla and Sena sculptures*, figs. 29 and 51.
- 32 *Yuktikalpataru*, Ch. XXXVI, pp. 62-63.
- 33 IA. XII, p. 202, verse 27.
- 34 HB, I. 656.
- 35 Irda, Rampal and Belava grants.
- 36 DHNI, II. 1066.
- 37 IA. 16. 206.
- 38 EI. X. 99.
- 39 EI. XXI. 96.
- 40 HIED, II. 44
- 41 Graves in *Journal Iron and Steel Institute* (1912), LXXXV, No. 1, pp. 200-202.
- 42 *Asiatic Researches* XV, p. 330.
- 43 Brown, Percy: *Ind. Architecture*, p. 127.
- 44 *Rasārṇava*, IV. 7.
- 45 *Rasaratnasamuchchaya*, X. 5. 6.
- 46 IB. III. 123 and 128.
- 47 *Sachau* I, p. 61.
- 48 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.) II, 196-197.
- 49 HIED II, p. 33.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p. 227.
- 51 *Yuktikalpataru*, p. 170, verses 24-29.
- 52 ŚP. verses 4672-4679.
- 53 Quoted by Niharranjan Roy: *Vāṅgūlī Itihāsa*, p. 182.
- 54 *Agni Purāṇa* (Vāṅabāsī), p. 475, Ch. 245. 21-22.
- 55 *Yuktikalpataru*, p. 170, verse 27.
- 56 ŚP. Verse 4676; *Niikalpataru* (ed. BORI), pp. 210f.
- 57 *Agni Purāṇa*, Ch. 245, verses 25-26, p. 475.
- 58 ŚP. Verse 4658, 4666.
- 59 *Rasaratnasamuchchaya* V, verses '11-72.
- 60 *History of Hindu Chemistry*, pp. 59-60.
- 61 *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.
- 62 *Rasaratnasamuchchaya* V. 113-114.
- 63 *Periplus*, p. 36.
- 64 *Marco Polo* II. 395.
- 65 *History of Hindu Chemistry*, p. 107.
- 66 *Ibid.*, II, p. 126.
- 67 *Ibid.* I, p. 58.
- 68 *Ibid* I, p. 62.

- 69 *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87.
- 70 *Ibid.* pp. 70 and 84.
- 71 *Ibid.*, Sanskrit texts, p. 26.
- 72 *Rasaratnasamuchchaya* III. 12-15, 24-25, 59 ; V. 32-34, 154-156, 176-179 ; *Rasaprakāśasudhākara* of Yaśodhara, Ch. X.
- 73 *Rasaratnasamuchchaya*, II. 5. 14.
- 74 *Ibid.*, quoted in *Hindu Chemistry*, Vol. II, pp. 17, 18, 22.
- 75 *Ibid.* I, p. 114.
- 76 *Rasārṇava*, XI. 24.
- 77 *Hindu Chemistry*, I, p. 250.
- 78 *Marco Polo* II, p. 300; Sastri: *Foreign Notices*, p. 177.
- 79 Gode in *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, VII (1946) pp. 148-160.
- 80 *Hindu Chemistry*, I, p. 123.
- 81 *Yuktikalpataru*, Viṭānalakṣaṇam, Verse 10.
- 82 *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, VII, p. 159.
- 83 *Taittirīyasaṁhitā*, V. 44 ; VI. 6.6.1.
- 84 *Gobhila Gr.* III. 1. 6.
- 85 *Mbh.* Anu., Ch. 95.
- 86 H.B.I., 457-458; *Vāṅgīr Itihāsa*. p. 554.
- 87 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.), II. 202.
- 88 *Marco Polo*, II. 395.
- 89 *Ibid.*, II. 393.
- 90 *Masudi* (ed. Ferand), 95.
- 91 *Deśināmamālā*, III. 21 ; V. 22.
- 92 *Bauddha Gāna O' Dohā*, Pada 13.
- 93 *Ibid.*, Pada 38.
- 94 *Ibid.*, Pada 49.
- 95 *Yuktikalpataru*, Ch. 120-21, pp. 224-229.
- 96 Sen, B. C. : *Historical Aspects of Bengal Ins.*, p. 541.
- 97 *Naiṣadhacharita*, 2. 60.
- 98 *Com.* of RC, II. 10.
- 99 *Deopara Ins.*, Verse 22.
- 100 EI. XXVIII, 55-56.
- 101 HIED (ed. Aligarh), Vol. II. p. 478.
- 102 RT, VIII. 1502.
- 103 *Ibid.* III. 354.
- 104 *Ibid.*, V. 84 ; VII. 347 ; 714, 1628.
- 105 *Raghuvamśam*, 16. 68.
- 106 *Śrīmad Bhāgavata*, III. 23. 16-21.
- 107 RT, VIII. 2145.
- 108 *Poona Orientalist*. XI (1946), pp. 1-21.
- 109 *Manu*, V. 120.
- 110 *Yāj.* I. 186-187.
- 111 *Poona Orientalist*, XI, p. 17.
- 112 *Ancient Accounts of India and China*, p. 36.
- 113 *Ibid.*, pp. 98-99.

- 114 Deopara Ins. Verse 11 in IB III.
- 115 RC, III 33-34.
- 116 *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣa-charita*, I. 229.
- 117 RT, VIII. 2833, 2835.
- 118 *Samayamātrikā*, VII. 14-17.
- 119 *Naiṣadhacharita*, I. 38, VII. 80, IX. 104, X. 116, XV. 33.
- 120 JUPHS, XIV. 4.
- 121 Kramrisch, S: *Pāla and Sena Sculptures*, Fig. 39.
- 122 *The Art of the Chandellas*, Plates 10, 11, 19, 22 and 30.
- 123 *Deśināmamālā*, III. 8.
- 124 *Ibid.*, I. 110 ; V. 1.
- 125 RT, VII. 1232.
- 126 EI. XXVIII. 244 ; XXIII. 139.
- 127 EI. X. 51.
- 128 JASB XVII. 145-162.
- 129 EI. XXVIII. 244 ; XXII. 139 ; XXIII. 141 ; *Naiṣadhacharita* XII. 35 ; XV. 45.
- 130 *Sukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.), II. 197-98.
- 131 *Ibid.*, IV. 3. 83-84, 86. 90, 94.
- 132 *Deśināmamālā*, I. 98 ; and *Sukranītisāra*. IV. III. 85.
- 133 EI IX. Bhatera CP., line 51.
- 134 EI. XXI. 96.
- 135 Sm. C. II, p. 223.
- 136 *Sachau* I, p. 101.
- 137 EI. XXIII, p. 138, lines 16-17.
- 138 EI. I, pp. 154 ff and 285.
- 139 Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa II. 223 mentions a variation of reading in *Kalpataru*.
- 140 *Aparārka*, pp. 792-93.
- 141 Sm. C. II, 222-23.
- 142 Yāj. II. 192 and Nārada, *Samyasyānapākarma* 2.
- 143 *Aparārka*, p. 794.
- 144 *Sukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.), IV. 5. 30.
- 145 Sm. C. II, p. 224.
- 146 IB. III, p. 49.

## CHAPTER X

### Currency, Banking and Usury

The plunder of accumulated gold and silver on an extensive scale in cities like Kanauj, Mathura and Somanatha by Sultān Mahmūd could not but produce an adverse effect on the currency system in Northern India. Gold had gone out of currency as a result of the large-scale devastation of the country by the Hūṇas. Excepting Kashmir, it took nearly five hundred years to make arrangement for issuing gold coins after the fall of the Gupta empire. The credit of resurrecting gold currency goes to Gāṅgeyadeva, who ascended the throne of Tripurī some time before 1019 A.D. He must have issued these in his kingdom when other parts of India were being devastated by Sultān Mahmūd. Varanasi, which had recently been incorporated by him in his own kingdom, was denuded of its riches by Ahmad Niyāltigin, Governor of the Punjab under the ruler of Ghaznī. The general impoverishment of the country prevented Gāṅgeyadeva's successors from continuing the issue of gold currency\*.<sup>1</sup> King Harsa (1089-1101 A.D.) was the only king of Kashmir during our period to issue gold and silver coins.

In the second-half of the eleventh century A.D. Kīrtivarman issued *Half-drammas* weighing 31 grains only.<sup>3</sup> Amongst his successors Madanavarman issued *Quarter-Drammas* and *Paramardī* full *Dramma*, weighing 61.64 grains. Prthvīdeva, Jājalladeva and Ratnadeva II belonging to the Kalachuri dynasty of Ratanpur issued gold coins weighing 13 to 60 grains.<sup>4</sup> The only Paramāra ruler to issue gold coin was Udayāditya, who ruled over parts of Central and Northern India between 1060 and 1087<sup>5</sup> A.D. A large number of gold coins of Govindachandra

\* Prof. Mirashi suggests that probably Karna struck the eight gold coins which bear the name of Gāṅgeyadeva and have been discovered in the village of Isurpur, Tahsil Rehli, Saugor district, on the ground that they differ considerably from other coins of Gāṅgeyadeva.<sup>2</sup>

Gāhaḍavāla has been discovered. These usually weigh 59 to 68 grains. The only ruler belonging to the Chaulukya dynasty of Gujarata whose gold coins have been discovered is Jayasīrṃha Siddharāja, two of whose gold coins have been found in the Jhansi district of the U. P.<sup>6</sup> Speaking of the gold coins issued by the Chāndellas, Kalachuris of Tripurī and Ratanpur, Tomaras, and Rāthors, Dr. S. N. Chakravarti observes: "The metal is generally very much debased".<sup>7</sup> Dr. Altekar draws attention to the depreciation of the gold coins in weight from 120 grains to 60 grains in the gold coins of Northern India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.<sup>8</sup> He also shows that silver coinage of the period was about ten grains lighter. Pṛthvīrāja III (c. 1177-1192 A.D.) issued silver and billon coins, whose weight varied from 47 to 53 grains. Dr. S. N. Chakravarty observes that on account of the scarcity of silver, "the Rajput states were forced to use billon as a substitute of silver".<sup>9</sup> According to Cunningham, "the Billon coins of mixed silver and copper which were adopted by all the later kings or Tomaras and Chauhāns, are called *Diliwals* or *Dilials* by the early Muham-madan writers".<sup>10</sup> The weight of copper coins of Govinda-chandra preserved in the Indian Museum weigh 37 to 49 grains, while those issued by the Tomaras and Chāhamānas are in the neighbourhood of 50 grains, in place of the ancient Indian standard *Kārṣāpaṇa* of 146 grains.

The standard money in many parts of Northern India appears to have been *Dramma*. The Gwalior inscription of Bhojadeva of Kanauj, dated 875 A.D., the Pehoa, Asni and Sivadonj inscriptions of the tenth century,<sup>11</sup> the stone-inscription of Aśvāka dated 1143 A.D.,<sup>12</sup> the Kiradu stone-inscription of Alhanadeva, dated VS 1209/1152 A.D.,<sup>13</sup> the Nadol plates of Prince Kīrtipāla dated 1160 A.D.<sup>14</sup> and the Besani<sup>15</sup> and Jaunpur<sup>16</sup> inscriptions of 1207 and 1216 A.D. refer to *Drammas*. The most interesting of these from the standpoint of history of currency is the Siyadoni inscription, which mentions four varieties of *Drammas*, and four other varieties of

coins, namely, *Pañchiyaka-dramma*, *Vigrahapāla-dramma*, *Vigrahapāla-ṣaṭka-dramma*, *Śrīmadūdivarāha-dramma*, *Varāha-kāyaviṃśopaka*, *Kākinī*, *Varāḷaka* and *Kapardaka*. "The *Pañchiyaka dramma*", according to P. N. Bhattacharyya, "appears to have been a piece of 5 *Boddikas*. As a *Boddika* weighs 11.2 grains, a *Pañchiyaka* could weigh only 56 grains."<sup>17</sup> Hemachandra mentions *Boddiā* as a coin, and this may be the same as *Boddikas*. Dr. V. S. Agrawala equates a *Boddika* with the old Bengali term of accounting called *Buḍi*, which consists of 5 *Gaṇḍīs* or 20 *Cowries* or quarter-*Pana*.<sup>18</sup> Cunningham takes *Boddika* as a corrupt form of *Pādika* which means one-fourth. He, of course, treats a *Boddika* as a quarter of silver *Purāṇa*. A copper *Boddika*<sup>19</sup> could be equal to twenty *Cowries*, but not a silver *Boddika*. Dr. Altekar in explaining the Shergadh (Kotah) inscription of V.S. 1075 also points out that the term *Vodri* means one-fourth of the copper *Pana* and was equivalent to twenty *Cowries*.<sup>20</sup> The *Pañchiyakadramma*, therefore, was equal to one hundred *Cowries*. The *Vigrahapāla-dramma* weighed 67.2 grains which is of the same weight as the *Saḍboddika-dramma* mentioned in the Jaunpur inscription. It was equal to 6 *Boddikas* or 120 *Cowries*. The weight of a gold *Śrīmadūdivarāha-dramma* was about 63 grains. It was, therefore, of a little higher value than a *Pañchiyaka* and a little lower than the *Vigrahapāla-dramma*.

A *Kapardaka* is the same as *Kapadi* as mentioned in the Bilhari inscription. It has been translated as one *Cowrie* shell by R. D. Banerji.<sup>21</sup> It has got, therefore, the same meaning as the *Varātaka*. According to the *Gaṇitasāra*, 20 *Varātakas* or *Cowrie* shells make one *Kāgeni* or *Kākinī*. Lakṣmīdhara<sup>22</sup> states that it is well-known that 4 *Kākinīs* make one *Pana* and 16 *Panaṣ* are equivalent to one *Purāṇa*. The term *Purāṇa* is frequently found in the Sena inscriptions. It means therefore,  $20 \text{ Varātakas} \times 4 \text{ Kākinīs} \times 16 \text{ Panaṣ} = 1280$  *Cowries*. This is also the finding of Dr. N. K. Bhattasali, who equates *Kāhana* and *Kārṣāpaṇa* with *Kapardaka*

*Purāṇa*.<sup>23</sup> He seems to have followed the lead of Thomas, who states that 16 *Paṇas* were equal to 1 *Kāhāwan* or *Kārṣāpaṇa* of silver.<sup>24</sup>

Stein has reconstituted the following table for calculating the currency of Kashmir, after taking into consideration all the literary references in Kashmirian literature and also the account of Abul Fazl

Designation.		Equivalent values on Abul Fazl's estimate.
12 <i>Dīnnāras</i> =	1 <i>Dvādaśa</i> ( <i>Bāhgaṇi</i> )	1/8th <i>Dām</i> or 1/320 rupee.
2 <i>Dvādaśa</i> =	25 <i>Dīnnāras</i> ( <i>Pañcha-viṃśatika</i> )	1/4th <i>Dām</i> or 1/360 rupee.
4 <i>Pañcha-viṃśatika</i> =	100 <i>Dīnnāras</i> (1 <i>Śata</i> , <i>Hāth</i> )	1 <i>Dām</i> or 1/40th rupee.
10 <i>Śata</i> =	1000 <i>Dīnnāras</i> (1 <i>Sahasra</i> , <i>Sāsūn</i> )	10 <i>Dām</i> or ¼ rupee.
100 <i>Sahasra</i> =	100,000 <i>Dīnnāras</i> (1 <i>Lakṣa</i> , <i>lākh</i> )	25 rupees.
100 <i>Lakṣa</i> =	10,000 <i>Dīnnāras</i> (1 <i>Koti</i> , <i>crore</i> )	2500 rupees.

Speaking of the traditional systems of counting current upto 1892 A.D. he states:

1 *Bāhgan* or 12 *Dīnnāras* = 8 *Cowries*.

1 *Pūntshu* or 25 *Dīnnāras* = 16 *Cowries*.

He further observes: "As 4 *Pūntshus* go to the *Hāth*, which is represented now by the pice or 1/64 of a rupee. it follows that  $16 \times 4 \times 64 = 4096$  *Cowries* are, or were, until quite recently reckoned in the rupee".<sup>25</sup> It may be noted here that the Kashmirian *Dīnnāra* was lower in value than the *Cowrie* as 8 *Cowries* were equal to 12 *Dīnnāras*. It was difficult to import and transport *Cowries* to Kashmir and this is why its price was higher there.

Some inscriptions refer to a coin called *Gādhaiyā* or *Gadyānas*. These are identified by Cunningham with *Ṣaḍbod-dikka-drammas* of Jaunpur inscription.

In spite of gold, silver, bullion and copper currency, the masses kept their account and transacted business in *Cowries*. We have already noted the use of *Cowrie* in the Siyadoni inscription and in the Bilhari inscription, which records the receipt of one *Kapardī* from each shop by the Śaiva ascetics.<sup>26</sup>

Kaśemendra in his *Samayamātrikā*<sup>27</sup> refers to a miserly merchant who sends his contribution to a dinner party one *Tolā* of oil, two *Tolās* of salt and two *Śvetakas* or *Cowries* for vegetables. In his *Kalāvilāsa*<sup>28</sup> he relates the story of another merchant who sent three *Cowries* every evening to his house for daily expenses. Kalhaṇa speaks of a favourite of King Saṃgrāmadeva who started his life with a *Varātaka* or *Cowrie* and finally amassed a crore.<sup>29</sup> From all these Stein concludes "that the *Cowree* was from early times used as a monetary token in Kashmir as elsewhere in India".<sup>30</sup> He further observes that "gold and silver cannot have formed in Hindu times an important part of the actual coined currency in Kashmir".<sup>31</sup>

A similar statement may be made with regard to the currency in Bengal. The *Charyāpadas* refer to the use of *Kāvaḍi* and *Voḍi*.<sup>32</sup> Minhāj states that when the Muhammedans for the first time came to Bengal they noticed no silver currency in the country but found the people using *Cowrie* shells in economic transactions.<sup>33</sup> The land-grants of the Sena period speak of *Purāṇa* and *Kapardaka-Purāṇas* indeed, but Dr. S. K. Chakravarti suggests that these were a mere abstract unit of account and that "payments were made in *Cowries* and a certain number of them came to be equated to the silver coin, the *Purāṇa*".<sup>34</sup> Chāṇdeśvara quotes Hārīta in his *Grihastharatnākara* (Page 447) to show that at the rate of 8 *Paṇas* monthly interest on 25 *Purāṇas*, the principal would be doubled in 4 years and 2 months.

There was a severe paucity of coined money in Orissa. Some of the land grants of the Somavarṃśī rulers and the Talcher copper-plates of Gayadatuṅga refer to rent in certain quantities of silver measured in *Palas*, *Māsas* and *Guñjās*.<sup>35</sup> The daily transactions were certainly carried on there in *Cowries*.

A close study of inscriptions, however, reveals that bigger transactions used to be carried on in many parts of Northern India in gold and silver. Even a remote corner of Eastern India like Assam used gold coins, as is testified to by the grant of 900 gold coins to a Brāhmaṇa of Varendrī by King



Jayapāla of Kamarupa,<sup>36</sup> who flourished in the eleventh century A.D. An inscription of the reign of Bhīma II of Gujarat, dated V.S. 1264/1207-08 A.D. shows that the Pratihāra (door-keeper) Sakhaḍa gave to one Rauta Uchchadeva together with his sons and grandsons, one *Dramma* yearly and one *Rūpaka* daily to some other persons.<sup>37</sup> This shows that the *Dramma* referred to above was gold *Dranuma* and that *Rupaka* was apparently made of silver.

The relative value of gold, silver and copper must have differed from one state to another, on account of the availability or otherwise of one metal in terms of others. Theoretically, 1 part of gold was equal to 16 parts of silver according to the twelfth-century mathematician Bhāskarāchārya, who states that 16 silver *Drammas* were equal to a golden *Niṣka*.<sup>38</sup> The same ratio is also prescribed in the *Śukranītisāra*, which states that gold is 16 times dearer than silver.<sup>39</sup> The same work states that silver is 80 times dearer than copper.<sup>40</sup> Dr. Altekar has shown however, that according to Bhāskarāchārya and the *Medinikōṣa* one silver *Dramma* was equal to 16 copper *Paṇas*. He further observes: "The silver unit in the currency at the time of Bhāskarāchārya was of about 50 grs.; and allowing for an alloy of 20%, the data in *Līlāvati* would show that 40 grains of silver were equal in value to  $16 \times 140$  grs. of copper. The ratio in the prices of the two metals would thus be 1: 56." This is a much higher ratio than the one mentioned by Śukra. We, however, do not know what the unit of the copper currency was actually in vogue in the time of *Līlāvati*. If we assume that it was a *Paṇa* of 20 and not 16 *Māshas*, then the ratio between the prices of the two metals would be about 1: 70."<sup>41</sup>

### Banking :

Merchants and manufacturers used to keep deposits of customers with them. We have not been able to find out any epigraphic evidence of the existence in Northern India of any guild accepting the deposits on promise to pay interest during

the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. The Siyadoni inscription records that in Samvat 969/912 A.D., the merchant Nāgāka gave to a deity the capital of 1350 *Śrīmadādivarāha-drammas* which had been invested with the distillers of spirituous liquor.<sup>42</sup> The Turkish raids, almost interminable warfare between the North Indian states and the frequent wars of succession which characterised the period under review, must have adversely affected the position of indigenous bankers. The old law-givers state that if the deposit be lost through act of God or the King or is stolen by thieves, the person who has accepted the deposit is not to be made liable to return them.<sup>43</sup> We may presume that in troublous period between 1030 and 1194 A.D. many such deposits were either plundered by invaders or taken away by the King for reasons of state. There are definite indications to show that the supply of capital was inadequate to meet the demand and, therefore, concessions had to be made in favour of the owners of capital to induce them to invest it in trade and industry, and also lend it for consumption purposes.

According to Manu the property which is mortgaged on the condition that in lieu of interest the fruits or profits of it are to be enjoyed by the creditor cannot be sold or gifted away by the latter even after a long time.<sup>44</sup> Medhātithi in explaining this verse says that the creditor cannot sub-mortgage such a property. But after a lapse of some three or four hundred years from the time of Medhātithi, Kullūkabhaṭṭa notes that it is a common practice in all countries for a mortgagee to execute a sub-mortgage of land. Capital could not be locked up indefinitely for a long time and so provision had to be made for making it available to the creditor by allowing him to sub-mortgage the property.

Kane has pointed out that Vijñāneśvara in explaining *Yājñavalkya* II.64 states that if the income from a mortgaged property is not sufficient to meet the interest wholly then the debtor may have to pay the principal and the unpaid part of the debt before redeeming his property.<sup>45</sup> This again shows that on account of scarcity of loanable funds, which are now

technically called liquid assets, a rate of interest was fixed even in such cases of loan in which the creditor was given, the right to enjoy the produce of the mortgaged property and that if he found its value less than that of stipulated rate of interest, he could charge the balance on the debtor. This was highly prejudicial to the debtor, because the creditor might not have applied sufficient doses of labour and capital to the land mortgaged or given inadequate food to the milch-cow pledged.

Manu and Gautama have distinctly laid down that "the amount of principal and interest recoverable at one time in a lump sum cannot be more than double of the money lent".<sup>46</sup> But Vijñāneśvara in explaining *Yājñavalkya* II. 39 stipulates certain conditions under which it is possible for the creditor to realise more than double of the amount lent. Of these the most important is that if the interest is received every day, month or year and is not claimed in a lump sum at one time then the total interest received by a creditor may be even several times more than the principal lent. Interest was certainly collected by the creditor periodically in most cases and in all these cases the law of *damdupat* could be evaded intentionally.

Merchants sometimes proved dishonest in their dealings with depositors. Kalhaṇa relates a story of such a merchant, who had taken a deposit of one lakh, of *Dīnnāras* from a customer. The deposit lay with him for a period of twenty or thirty years, during which the customer used to take out small amounts for his expenditure. When he asked for the return of the balance, the merchant made an absurd and fraudulent statement from his account book as follows: "...600 (*Dīnnāras*) have been taken by you for tolls in crossing the bridge. A hundred was given to the leather worker for the repair of a torn shoe and of a whip. For 50 (your) servant-girl took *ghee* against a blister on the foot. From pity you gave 300 to a potter-woman who was crying over her broken load of pots. Look again and again, here they are put down on the birch-bark. For a 100 you have

brought from the market mice and fish-juice to feed tenderly the kittens of the cat. For seven hundreds were bought butter as an ointment for the feet as well as rice-flower, *ghee* and honey on the occasion of the baths of the *Śrāddha* fortnight. Your little boy took honey and ginger when suffering from an attack of cough,..... In order to get rid of an obstinate beggar who tore his testicles and was expert in assaults, you gave him 300. For the incense, the roots of the *Sauda* plant and the onions (presented) to the *Gurus*, at an average (estimate) of the whole cost one hundred or two must be counted." He ultimately claimed that interest must be paid on these advances as the total of these sums, according to his reckoning exceeded the amount of the original deposit. The merchant speaks of the deposit as a closed one bearing no interest. King Uchchala, however, decided that as the deposited amount was used by the merchant it must bear interest. We have made this lengthy quotation because here Kalhaṇa draws a realistic picture of the Kashmirian society in the twelfth century. He makes a sweeping remark regarding the character of indigenous bankers as follows: "A merchant in a law-suit relating to the embezzlement of a deposit is more to be dreaded than a tiger; because he shows a face smooth as oil, uses his voice but very little and shows a gentle appearance".<sup>47</sup>

Yājñavalkya<sup>48</sup> has laid down that if the depositee makes use of the article deposited without the permission of the depositor, he should be fined and made to return the deposit with interest. But Chanḍeśvara states that if the deposit is not sealed and if the depositee uses it for sometime and then replaces it, no blame or liability attaches to him.<sup>49</sup>

A highly interesting document relating to the use of *Hundis* in the eleventh century A.D. has been quoted from Kṣemendra's *Lokaṭṭrakāśa* by Stein. It relates to a transaction for a sum of 10,000 *Dinnāras*,\* which is payable at

\* The *Huṇḍikā* term runs as follows:

*deyam śrī prāpte satī viṣaye Jayananeya dām (ara) amukenā-*

Jayavana, modern Zevan, within a period of one year. The *Lokaprakāśa*, which was originally written by Kṣemendra and later on supplemented by various other persons belonging to the Hindu period of Kashmir, uses the terms, *dīnnārojjāmachirikā* or acknowledgment of a debt in *Dīnnāra* or cash, *dhānyojjāmachirikā* or acknowledgment of a debt in rice and *bhāṇḍojjāmachirikā* or acknowledgment of a debt on pawn.<sup>51</sup> In his *Samayamātrikā* too we come across the term *Ujjāmappatrikā*, meaning a document acknowledging the receipt of a loan.<sup>52</sup> It was usual, therefore, to have documents relating to a loan transaction. Yājñavalkya and Nārada prescribe that the creditor must either write on the reverse of the document or issue separate receipts for the part payment made to him by the debtor.<sup>53</sup> The Jaunpur brick-inscription dated 1217 A.D. shows that one Gaṅgadeva borrowed 2250 *Draṇmas* on the security of cultivated lands and attested his own signature on the inscribed bricks.<sup>54</sup> Unscrupulous money-lenders used to take advantage of the illiteracy of debtors. Dāmodaragupta relates that Hara used to write ten times the amount lent.<sup>55</sup>

The merchants used to borrow capital from indigenous bankers just as they do at present. The rate of interest charged was much heavier in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. Both Lakṣmīdhara and Chaṇḍeśvara quote with approval the time honoured rate of 1/80th of the principal lent as interest per month on secured debts. This means that the principal was doubled in 6 years and 8 months, or that it yielded an interest of 15 per cent.<sup>56</sup> The Mahājānas of Śivapura paid 25% interest on the deposit of 6 *Gadyānas*. This is nearly the same rate as the rate of 2% per month prescribed by Lakṣmīdhara and Chaṇḍeśvara on loans with-

*mukaputrena kuṁh vā neśāne sati dharmataḥ dīnnāra-sahasraśake aṁke di 10,000 etc. dīnnārūadyōrbhya saṁvatsaraṁ tāvāt | prāptalābhād | dī (nnāra) sahasraekam nyāyaprāvaparīhāre sati ruddhā nibandham nyāyatāṇḍatayā (?) yasya hasteyaṁ huṇḍikā tasyaivaṁ.*

out pledge or mortgage *bandhaka-rahita*.<sup>58</sup> Alberuni writes<sup>59</sup>, "The usury or taking percentages is forbidden... only to the Śūdra. It is allowed to take percentages, as long as his profit is not more than one-fiftieth of the capital" (i.e., not more than 2 %). This was the ordinary rate for perfectly secure debts. But Vijñāneśvara upholds the charging of a rate of 10 % per month or 120 % per year from merchants who had to traverse dense forests for carrying on trade ; sea-faring traders being charged double this rate. He adduces the argument that these exorbitant rates are allowed because of the great danger of the loss of even the principal as the debtors may perish by shipreck or from the attacks of robbers and wild beasts. This apprehension of losing the principal shows that there were persons and institutions to advance money to traders engaged in risky trades on personal security, because had there been sufficient security, the question of losing the principal would not have arisen at all.

It was customary to lend not only money but also various articles of consumption like grains, fruits, ghee, milk, woollen, silken and cotton clothes, salt, oils, wines, *gur*, yarn and leather. Chanḍeśvara in his *Vivādaratnākara*<sup>61</sup> has given an elaborate list of such articles, compiled from *smṛti* works. He also mentions the maximum that can be recovered by the creditor from the debtor. He quotes Kātyāyana to show that the maximum recoverable in the case of oils, liquors, ghee, raw-sugar and salt was eight-fold ; in the case of metals other than gold and silver five times ; and in the case of fruits, silk, wool, pearls, corals, gold and silver double of what is lent out. He also quotes from Bṛhaspati a text approving the recovery of a loan of seeds by the payments of five times the quantity lent. This was, of course, the maximum. The actual rate must have depended on the relative intensity of the desire to take the loan and that of lending out. In any case, the lot of the debtor was a hard one. This is why the law-givers condemn the profession of the money-lender. Bṛhaspati has defined *Kusīda* or interest as

that which is taken fourfold or even eight-fold without any qualm of conscience from a wretched man who is sinking or distressed.<sup>62</sup> Lakṣmīdhara, condemns the practices of charging heavy interest and compound interest. He further observes that the greatest sinner is the usurer who outweighs all other sinners.<sup>63</sup> But at the same time he recognises that the business of money-lending is free from dangers of draughts, rats, etc.<sup>64</sup>

#### REFERENCES TO CHAPTER X

(Currency, Banking and Usury).

- 1 Cunningham: *Coins of Mediaeval India*, p. 70.
- 2 *Numismatic Supplement*, No. XVII, JASB 1912, p. 123, pl. VI; Mirashi in JNSI. III (1941), Pt. I. p. 26.
- 3 Cunningham: *op. cit.*, p. 79.
- 4 JASB. XXVI (1930), N. 35.
- 5 Singhal, C. R.: *Bibliography of Indian Coins*, Pt. I, p. 96.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 96.
- 7 *Journal of the Department of Letters* XXX (1938), p. 37.
- 8 Altekar, A. S. in JNSI. II, p. 2.
- 9 *Journal of the Department of Letters* XXX (1938), p. 38.
- 10 Cunningham: *op. cit.*, p. 89.
- 11 EI. I. 184; IA. XVI. 174; EI. I. 162-179.
- 12 EI. IX. 32-33.
- 13 *Ibid.*, XI, 43-46.
- 14 EI. IX. 69.
- 15 ASR. XXI. 102.
- 16 ASR. XI. 176.
- 17 JASB. XXVI. No. 34.
- 18 JUPHS. XVIII. pp. 196 f.
- 19 Cunningham: *op. cit.*, p. 50.
- 20 EI. XXIII. 140.
- 21 *Memoirs of Arch. Survey*, No. 23 (by Banerji, R. D.: *Haihayas of Tripuri*, p. 114).
- 22 Grihastha, p. 219.
- 23 *Baṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā*, 1339 B. S., p. 90.
- 24 Thomas: *Ancient Indian Weights*, p. 19, f.n. 3.
- 25 Stein in RT. Vol. II (Note H., Appendices), pp. 322-324.
- 26 Bilhari *incr.*, verse 80.
- 27 *Samayamātrikā*, VIII. 80.
- 28 *Kulāvilāsa*, II. 5, 7.
- 29 RT. VII. 112.
- 30 Stein in RT. Vol. II (Appendices), p. 323.

- 31 *Ibid.*, p. 317.
- 32 *Bauddha Gāna O Dohā*, Pada No. 26.
- 33 HBI. 669 quoting *Tabakāt-i-Nāsiri* (translation), p. 556.
- 34 IHQ. VIII-597.
- 35 Sircar, D. C. in EI. XXVIII (1949-50), pp. 46-47.
- 36 EI. XIII, pp. 292, 295.
- 37 IA. XI. 338.
- 38 *Līlāvafī* I. 2. quoted by Altekar in JNSI II. p. 9.
- 39 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.) IV. 2. 92-93.
- 40 *Ibid.*, IV. 2. 92.
- 41 JNSI. II, p. 13.
- 42 EI. I. 162-179.
- 43 *Manu*, VIII. 189 ; *Yāj.*, II. 66, *Nārada*, V 9 and 12 ; *Kātyāyana*, 593.
- 44 *Manu*, VII. 143.
- 45 HDS. III, p. 430.
- 46 *Manu*, VIII. 151 ; *Gautama*, XII. 28.
- 47 RT. VIII. 123-160.
- 48 *Yāj.* II. 66.
- 49 *Vivādaratnākara*, pp. 86-87.
- 50 Stein in RT. II. (Note H., Appendices), p. 314.
- 51 *Ibid.* II, 147 f.n.
- 52 *Samayamātrikā*, VIII. 96.
- 53 *Yāj.* II. 93 ; *Nārada* IV. 114.
- 54 JUPHS XVIII, p. 196.
- 55 *Kuṭṭānimatam* (ed. T. N. Ray), verse 746.
- 56 *Grihastha* ; pp. 217-219 : *Grihastharatnākara*, pp. 446-447.
- 57 Yewur Inscr. (EI. XII. 273).
- 58 *Grihastha*., p. 218 ; *Grihastharatnākara*, p. 447.
- 59 Sachau. II, p. 150.
- 60 *Mitākṣarā* on *Yāj.*, II. 38.
- 61 *Vivādaratnākara*, pp. 17-19.
- 62 *Bṛhaspati* (SBE. XXXIII) p. 320, verse 2.
- 63 *Grihastha*, pp. 215-216.
- 64 *Ibid.*, p. 219.



## CHAPTER XI

### Public Finance

Lakṣmīdhara sets up before the rulers the high ideals preached by Kātyāyana regarding the financial administration of the state. Citing two verses from Kātyayana, which, however, cannot be traced in Kane's edition of the work, Lakṣmīdhara declares that the king is the supporter of all those whom there is none else to look after, he is the son to the sonless and father to the orphans and the asylum to the homeless. He specifically mentions the duty of the king to maintain carefully the learned Brāhmaṇas, widows and the helpless persons.<sup>1</sup> In describing the plan of settling the *durga* or fortified town, he follows the lead of the *Matsya Purāṇa*<sup>2</sup> which prescribes that it should have a majority of Vaiśyas and Śūdras, many artisans and a few Brāhmaṇas, all of whom should be devoted to the king and all should be free from the burden of heavy taxation. Being an orthodox Brāhmaṇa himself, he takes care to quote from Bṛhaspati the adage that the king should not impose any tax on the Brāhmaṇas learned in the Vedas; and that it is the duty of the king to endow them with land and houses so that they may not have any difficulty in earning their livelihood.<sup>3</sup> The numerous grants which the Gāhaḍavāla kings made to the Brāhmaṇas show that Lakṣmīdhara's recommendation in this respect was followed scrupulously by them. We have to examine whether in the matter of taxation they were equally solicitous of earning the good opinion of all classes of subjects.

Lakṣmīdhara does not lay down the rate at which land revenue, the principal source of income in an agricultural country, should be levied. He quotes the views of Manu, Bṛhaspati, Viṣṇu and Gautama in this respect without stating whether it should be levied at 1/6th, 1/8th or 1/12th as Manu holds, or at 1/6th, 1/8th or 1/10th as recommended

by Gautama and Bṛhaspati, or it should be at a flat rate of 1/6th as prescribed by Viṣṇu.<sup>4</sup> It is interesting to note that Someśvara, the author of the *Mānasollāsa*, also does not lay down any specific rate. He simply directs that one-sixth, one-eighth or one-twelfth of the share of the corn produced should be collected as *bhāga* or land revenue paid in kind according to the fertility of the soil.<sup>5</sup> As a matter of fact, it is not advisable to prescribe one uniform rate of taxation with regard to land which has got access to water from river or canal and to the land which has to depend on monsoon for irrigation. Moreover, there are numerous other considerations like location of the land near market, composition of its soil etc., which make it necessary to levy land revenue at rates fluctuating between one-sixth (16½%) and one-eighth (12½%). It is not likely that in some of the states in Northern India during this period the rate was as high as 25% or 33%, because Manu<sup>6</sup> as well as Kauṭilya<sup>7</sup> allow the King to levy one-third or one-fourth of the crop in times of distress. With frequent invasions and interminable wars the kings had some justification to treat the time as an abnormal one. This may be the reason which led Chanḍeśvara to explain away the term *Ṣaḍbhāga* as a mere figurative term and to recommend the levying of such amount as would be found necessary to meet the requirements of Government and at the same time not felt as oppressive by the subjects.<sup>8</sup> The author of the *Sukranītisāra* was more alive to the needs of the state in recommending a much higher share of crops as land revenue. He says that the king should take the traditional one-sixth share from barren and rocky soils. This is nothing but a naive suggestion for showing outward compliance with the *Smṛti* texts, because barren soil by its very name is precluded from producing anything. For other types of land, the revenue charged is to vary from 25% to 50% according to the means of irrigational facilities available. It is to be ½ for land enjoying normally good rainfall and also drained by

river;  $\frac{1}{3}$  for land irrigated by tanks and  $\frac{1}{4}$  for those drawing supply of water from canals and wells.<sup>9</sup> Dr. M. H. Gopal suggests that one-sixth was the pure land-tax, while the rates  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{3}$  or  $\frac{1}{4}$ th include irrigation cess also. It is extremely doubtful however, whether the Ricardian theory of pure rent was known to the old law-givers of India. Dr. Ghoshal uses considerable ingenuity in suggesting that "while the older authorities apparently make the gross produce the basis of assessment, the *Śukranīti* seems to show that  $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of net produce was taken to be the proper rate of land-revenue".<sup>10</sup> He has probably arrived at this conclusion from the statement in the *Śukranītisāra* to the effect that the taxation on ordinary dry lands should be such that the *net produce* should be twice the cost of production, including the government dues.<sup>11</sup> This, of course, does not yield the conclusion that the book recommends 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ % net produce as the share of the state. For example, if labour costs 300, seed, manure, interest and management costs 50 each and government dues 250, totalling 750 and the value of net produce be 1500; the land revenue in this case will be 1/6th of the latter. It would be safer to treat *Śukranītisāra's* prescription of higher rate as simply due to the exigencies of time.

Contemporary inscriptions make references to the following taxes: *bhāga*,<sup>12</sup> *bhoga*<sup>13</sup> or periodical supply of fruits, firewoods, flowers etc., which the subjects had to make either to the King or to his local agents, and *hiraṇya*<sup>14</sup> which has been interpreted as a tax in cash levied upon special crops as distinguished from tax in kind called *bhāga* levied ordinary crops.

### *Śulka :*

Next to *Bhāga*, the most important source of revenue was *Śulka*, so far as the volume of yield was concerned. Kshīrasvāmin, who flourished in the latter half of the eleventh century,<sup>15</sup> commenting on the term *Ghaṭṭādideya* used in Amarakoṣa as the synonym of *śulka* states that *ādi* refers to

ferry duties, the tolls paid at the military stations of police outposts and also the transit duties paid by the merchants. *Śulka*, therefore, was much more comprehensive than customs and tolls in the eleventh century A.D. Yājñavalkya states that the king is entitled to 1/20th part as *śulka* because he fixes the price of articles.<sup>16</sup> Vijñāneśvara interprets it as the right of the king to take 5% of the price as fixed by himself. Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Kullūkabhaṭṭa commenting on Manu<sup>17</sup> state, however, that the king is entitled to 5% of the profit derived from the merchandise. There is a world of difference between 5% of the price of an article and 5% of its profits. *Agni Purāṇa* goes a step further in prescribing a higher rate of *śulka* on foreign merchandise as its recommendation is that so much *śulka* should be levied as would leave the merchant a profit of 5% only.<sup>18</sup> In approving 240% rate of interest on capital lent to merchants engaged in overseas trade, Vijñāneśvara has drawn attention to the grave risks of foreign trade. Not to speak of the merchants of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, very few will agree to carry on transaction on foreign merchandise at present on 5% profit. The recommendation of Govindarāja and Kullūkabhaṭṭa regarding the levy of 5% of the profit of the merchandise as *śulka* does not seem to be practicable. If it is difficult to apprise the value of an article correctly it is hundred times more difficult for an officer stationed at a gate, police outpost or military station to ascertain the profit which will accrue out of a transaction.

Trade was very much hampered on account of the imposition of *śulka* in all the states through which a commodity had to pass. Roads were infested with robbers, means of transport was slow, rate of interest exorbitant and taxation rather heavy. It is rather surprising that in spite of all these difficulties the channel of foreign trade was not choked up.

The types of *śulka* levied in Rajputana and other states of Northern India may be illustrated by the following levies. Sometimes one *hāraka* of barley corn<sup>19</sup> and two *palikās* of

oil from every oil-machine<sup>20</sup> were levied and granted in favour of deities. The Chāhamāna ruler Alhaṇadeva assigned 5 *Drammas* every month from the *śulkamaṇḍapikā* of Naḍḍūla in favour of a Jaina temple, and 2 *Drammas* every year from each of the 12 villages in Naḍḍūla to the temple of Jina Mahāvīra.<sup>21</sup> Another Nadol grant states that Mahāmāṇḍalika Pratāpasimha, a feudatory of the Chaulukya King Kumārapāla, granted one *rūpaka* per day out of the collection at the customs-house.<sup>22</sup> We do not get, however, an exact idea as to the rate at which *śulka* was imposed by these feudatory rulers. But this much is certain that the collection was much greater in the cities than in villages. In the reign of Alhaṇadeva we find that whereas from twelve villages only two *Drammas* per annum were granted to a temple, sixty *Drammas* were granted per year from the customs-house of Naḍḍūla. In the kingdom of the Chaulukyas of Anahillapātaka, the Somanatha temple inscription dated V.S. 1074/1017 A.D. refers to the daily gift of a *karṣa* or about 3/4th of a tolā of *ghee* out of the *maṇḍapikā*-tax by three merchants.<sup>23</sup> Rattaraja, a feudatory chieftain assigned to a temple and to the ascetics therein the following taxes: one *gadyāna* of gold from every foreign vessel and one *dhāraṇa* of gold from every ship arriving from Kandamuliya.<sup>24</sup> In the kingdom of the Paramāras, the Arthuna inscription dated V.S. 1136/1080 A.D.<sup>25</sup> refers to dues collected in the market. The place was in Banswara in Rajputana. The deity was granted (a) one cocoanut for every *bhāraka* of cocoanut; (b) a *māraka* for each *mūtaka* of salt; (c) one nut for every 1000 areca-nuts; (d) one *palikā* on every *ghāṭaka* of butter and sesame oil; (e) 1½ *rūpakas* on each *koṭika* of clothing fabrics; (f) 2 *pulakas* of a *jala* (i.e., bunch of buds) (g) 2 *santas* on each *laḡaḡa*; (i.e., bar of gold or silver); (h) a *panaka* on each *karṣa* of oil; (i) a *Vṛṣa-viṃśopaka* on each load of cattle feeder; (j) one *Dramma* on every pile of sugar etc., (k) a *hāraka* of barley on every machine-wheel; (l) one *bhāraka* on every 20 packs of loaded grain; (m) one *chhaṅga* on every *bhāraka* of loaded grain etc. *Śulka* was also levied

by the Chandella kings<sup>26</sup> and Vikramasimha, the feudatory chief of Gwalior.<sup>27</sup> An example of customs duty is given in the *Mānasollāsa*.<sup>28</sup> It is prescribed that when the native sailors return to the harbour along with goods, the king should charge 10% of the price of the merchandise purchased as duty.

### *Excise duty :*

All mediaeval texts enumerate taxes on the following items, which may be classed under excise duty : frankincense, medicine, bamboo, leather, earthen and stone products, honey and ghee, minerals like gold, silver, copper, zinc, iron, gems, lead, glasses,<sup>29</sup> etc. Lakṣmīdhara<sup>30</sup> endorses the levy of 2% on gold as mentioned in Manu and Viṣṇu. The inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavāla kings also refer to taxes on wood and grass,<sup>31</sup> and mines.<sup>32</sup> *Kāṭaka*<sup>33</sup> and *Visatiathuprasthaka*,<sup>34</sup> mentioned in the Gāhaḍavāla grants, may have been a tax on each *kāṭaka* and *prasthaka* weight of a commodity. The *pratīhāraprasthakara*<sup>35</sup> mentioned in Basahi grant may have been likewise a tax collected on some commodities by the Pratīhāra. The Chaulukya ruler Bhīma II ordered that the merchants of Salakhanapura were to pay the following dues for the maintenance of temples, viz., madder (*mañjiṣṭhā*), hingulla, coral (*pravālu*), camphor (*karpūra*), cloth, cocoanut, medicinal plants, sugar, dates, *śrikhaṇḍa*, *kastūrī*, *kumkum*, *aguru*, *jāiphala*, *jaitrī*, and *hing*.<sup>36</sup> Another inscription relates to the levying of four *rūpakas* from each *vumvaka* of distillers in the Paramāra kingdom.<sup>37</sup>

### *Octroi duties :*

As in Mauryan times, octroi duties continued to be levied in the period under survey. The Nadlai stone-inscription, dated V.S. 1195 states that the feudatory ruler granted 1/20th part of the income (*abhavya*) "derived from the loads on bullocks" passing through Nadlai.<sup>38</sup> In another Nadol inscription, dated V.S. 1202, the charges are stated in greater details.<sup>39</sup> Two *rūpakas* were charged on each bullock carrying twenty *pālās* of load and one *rūpaka* for each cart carrying commodities.

*Road Cess and tolls :*

The *Sukranītisāra* informs us that the kings were authorised to ask for payment of tolls for using the highways.<sup>40</sup> The practice of collecting tolls from caravans and road cess was current in Gujarat during the period under survey.<sup>41</sup> Inscriptions too refer to the levying of tolls on roads by the Gāhaḍa-vālas<sup>42</sup> and the Chāhamāna ruler Sāmantasimha.<sup>43</sup> The latter chieftain issued an order that when a caravan consisted of more than ten camels and 20 bullocks, a cess had to be paid. Every such caravan had to pay one *pālū*\* of goods. If the owner of the caravan failed to pay, he had to pay probably a fine of ten *Bhīṃapriyā-viṃśopaka* coins. Similarly the Paramāra King Jayasimha assessed one *viṃśopaka* coin on every bull that passed through the road.<sup>44</sup>

*Sales Tax :*

Sometimes sales tax had to be paid by dealers in different types of commodities. The Anavada inscription records that during the reign of Sāraṅgadeva, ruling at Anahillapāṭaka in V.S. 1348/c. 1291 A.D. the sellers agreed to pay at the following rates:  $\frac{1}{2}$  *Dramma* for selling one *dhādī* of madder, 1 *Dramma* for one *dhāḍa* of solonum melongana (*hingudī*), one *pālī* from every jar of *ghee* and dealers in grains one portion from each cart filled with grain.<sup>45</sup>

*Trade Tax :*

The *Sukranītisāra* allows the king to levy taxes on shops.<sup>46</sup> A chieftain ruling in Rajputana assigned to a temple, one *Dramma* on each shop during the Chaitra and sacred thread festivals and one *Dramma* on all shops of braziers every month.<sup>47</sup>

*Escheat :*

An important source of revenue of the Chaulukya kingdom

\* According to Dr. H. C. Ray *pālū* is a kind of weight; "4 *pālū*=1 *pāyalī*; 5 *pāyalīs*=1 *māṇā*; 4 *māṇā*=1 *sei*; 2 *sei*=1 *mar*" (DHNI II. 1113).

was escheat<sup>48</sup> and confiscation<sup>49</sup> of goods of persons dying without male heirs. Though some of the old texts prohibit<sup>50</sup> this practice, yet Aparārka approves of it<sup>51</sup> so far as non-Brāhmaṇa communities were concerned. King Kumārapāla allowed the widows to keep the property of their husbands.<sup>52</sup> The Managoli inscription, dated 1178 A.D. confirms the statement made here. The inscription runs thus<sup>53</sup>; "if any one should die at Manigavalli without sons, his wife, female children ... and any kinsmen and relatives of the same *gotra*, who may survive, should take possession of all his property, that is bipeds, quadrupeds, coins, grains, house and field; if none should survive, the authorities of the village should take over the property as *dharmadeya* property."

#### *Other taxes :*

Taxes like *Kara*<sup>54</sup>, which probably means a general property tax, *daśāparādha*, *pratyādāya*,<sup>55</sup> *nidhinikṣepa*,<sup>56</sup> *valādi*<sup>57</sup> *jalakara*<sup>58</sup>, *lavaṇakara*<sup>59</sup>, *viśayadāna*,<sup>60</sup>, which we find in the Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions are also mentioned in Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* and other earlier *Śmṛti* texts and inscriptions. *Valādi* may have been a tax for recruitment of army. It may be compared to *senābhakta* of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* and similar tax mentioned in the *Śukranītisāra*.<sup>61</sup> Śukra provides that when the king is preparing an army to destroy the enemy he should receive from the people special grants of fines and *śulka*. *Jalakara* was undoubtedly an irrigational cess. We find references to *daśabandha* in inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavāla king dated 1161 and 1162<sup>62</sup> of the Vikrama era and a Chāhamāna King of Nadol. The Nadol inscription of VS 1200/1143 A.D. records that Bhamana, a Karṇāṭa *Rāṇaka* exempted the *pramadākula* or dancing girls of the temple of Usapattana from paying *daśabandha*, which according to Dr. Bhandarkar was "possibly a kind of tax equal to one-tenth of their income".<sup>63</sup> Another old tax which continued to be levied during the period under survey was a tax on gambling.



The Arthuna inscription<sup>64</sup> informs us that two *rūpakas* were levied on every gambling house in the Banswara state.

### *New taxes :*

From the days of the composition of the Mahābhārata upto the end of the twelfth century A.D., the law-givers have repeatedly stated that the first principle of public finance is that taxes should not increase. This maxim is suitable for a static society. A tax which trenches on the capital has always been condemned. Lakṣmīdhara quotes the opinions of *Manu* VII. 139 and *Yājñavalkya* I. 340-341 and *Kātyāyana* (Kane's edition, verse 75) to this effect that taxes should be only on what accrues.<sup>65</sup> The author of the *Śukranītisāra* also states categorically that new taxes and duties are vexatious to the people. How far the people actually became disaffected on account of heavy taxation is clear from the reverses of the fortune of the Kaivarta leader Bhīma in Bengal.<sup>67</sup>

Against the injunctions of the *Śukranītisāra*,<sup>68</sup> which lays down that the king in normal times should not levy taxes on places of pilgrimage and properties consecrated to divine purposes, the Chaulukya kings as well as kings of Bengal levied taxes on *firthas*. The *Prahaṇḍhachintāraṇī*<sup>69</sup> and verse 36 of the *Sukritasaṁkīrtana*<sup>70</sup> of Arisimha state that at the request of her mother King Jayasimha remitted a tax imposed on pilgrims visiting Somanathapaṭṭana by the officials at Bahuloda. Merutuṅga also informs us that the pilgrim-tax yielded 72 lakhs of coins. A parallel case was the levy of tax on the Kashmiris performing *śrāddha* at Gaya as mentioned in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.<sup>71</sup> The kings of the Varman dynasty of Bengal also collected dues from sacred places. The Belava copper-plate states that Bhojavarman had an officer called *Pūthikāvitta*.<sup>72</sup> Dr. B. C. Sen thinks that he was probably an officer "engaged in collecting some kind of state-dues from visitors to sacred places or from incomes accruing to religious institutions".<sup>73</sup>

The inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavāla kings refer to the levy of new taxes like *kumaragadiānaka*<sup>74</sup> *yamalīkamvalī*, of *Yavalīkamvalī*,<sup>76</sup> *varavajha*<sup>77</sup> *gokara*, *pravaṇīkara* and *turuṣkadaṇḍa*.<sup>78</sup> The exact nature of these unusual taxes are not known to us. These were also not levied in any other part of Northern India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, A.D. We can make some plausible conjectures only. *Kumaragadiānaka* may have been a tax in gold coins known as *kumāragadyāna*. The epigraphical records from Karnāṭaka and Tamil states mention *Gadyānaka* coins which was equal to two *Kalañju* coins.<sup>80</sup> *Gokara* was probably a tax on the milk of cows. It may be pointed out here that the *Śukranūṭisāra* clearly forbids<sup>81</sup> the king from collecting taxes on the milk of cows and rice for family consumption and the king should purchase rice and cloth for his use. *Turuṣkadaṇḍa* was levied for the first time in the reign of the first real founder of the Gāhaḍavāla state, Chandradeva, and it is mentioned in all of his grants excepting B.A.S. grant dated V.S. 1154/1097 A.D.<sup>82</sup> It continued to be levied by his successors Madanapāla or Madanachandra (c. 1104-1114 A.D.), Govindachandra and Vijayachandra (c.1155-1170 A.D.). Neither the grants of Jayachandra nor of his son Hariśchandra mention the imposition of this tax. We have already discussed the nature of this tax in Chapter IV.

In the kingdom of the Kalachuri ruler Jayasinha we have references to certain new taxes,<sup>83</sup> like those levied at resting place or camping ground and village-headman's dues (*paṭṭakilādaya*).

Another tax called *Talarabhavya* is mentioned in the Sanderav inscription<sup>84</sup> of Kalhaṇa, dated V.S. 1221. The term *Talarabhavya* is also mentioned in a Mangrol inscription. The editor of the inscription interprets the word *Talarabhavya* as "revenue of a *talara*"<sup>85</sup> area.

The *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* gives details of many new taxes on the people of Kashmir during the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. The passing away of Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa coincides with the beginning of the misery of the Kashmirians. From the

close of the ninth century A.D. Śaṅkaravarman and Queen Diddā began levying forced labour and new imposts.<sup>86</sup> At the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. soon after the murder of Tuṅga, the greedy King Saṅgrāmarāja appointed Mataṅga, "an expert in the science of fleecing the subjects" who filled the treasury of the king.<sup>87</sup> The king was aware of his shortcomings. Kalhana sarcastically observes that he showed true judgment by not establishing even a drinking-place (*prapā*) and "that the wealth he owned was unlawfully acquired".<sup>88</sup> King Ananta also filled his treasury by levying *dvādaśabhāga*<sup>89</sup> or impost of one-twelfth on the people at the suggestion of Kṣema. Later on Haladhara, the Prime Minister, seems to have abolished the additional impost.<sup>90</sup> Ananta's successor Kalaśa also did not give people respite from fresh taxation.<sup>91</sup> The next king Harṣa imposed a labour-tax namely, the carrying of loads, against which, the members of the Corporation of the *Purohitas* of the temple of Bhīmakeśava went on a fast.<sup>92</sup> He also imposed fresh imposts and is reported to have appointed even a "prefect of night soil" to raise revenue.<sup>93</sup> Famine conditions did not melt his heart. When a great famine occurred in 1099-1100 A.D. the king went on exacting heavy fines. The burden of these taxes fell so heavily on the people that it seemed "just as if a boulder (were thrown) on an old bullock which has become worn out by (dragging) the plough".<sup>94</sup> They revolted and on one occasion their cause was supported by the *Ḍāmaras*. The king immediately gave an order of suppression.<sup>95</sup> The people of Kashmir got some relief during the reign of Uchchala. But fiscal oppressions again began during the period of Sussala's rule (1112-1130 A.D.). He collected "greater treasures" as the chronicler puts it.<sup>96</sup> Gauraka also increased the amount in the treasury and the result was that the strength of the country was sapped. Even during the reign of the wise King Jayasinha there were exactions. Mahattama Ānanda levied taxes on various auspicious occasions (*maṅgalyadāṇḍa*).<sup>97</sup> Chitraratha, the Lord of the Gate, harassed the people by ever-increasing imposts. His servants confiscated even the grazing-land and

the sacred cows.<sup>100</sup> Consequently, the Brāhmaṇas of Avantipura went on a fast. The King paid no heed to the lamentation of his subjects "Look, how the subjects are ruined in their helplessness by a rogue of a minister, while the King imperturbable in his kindness (to him), pays no regard to them".<sup>101</sup>

All these instances reveal that the rulers of Northern India adopted all sorts of ingenious devices to raise funds, which were increasingly needed to meet their military expenditure. Somadeva in his *Nītivākyāmrta* recommends that in case the treasury is depleted it should be filled up by taking away the surplus wealth of merchants, temples and Brāhmaṇas, after leaving them the amounts which are necessary for performing religious service, sacrifices and meeting the expenditure for maintaining the kinsmen respectively. The king should also appropriate the wealth of rich widows, courtesans, village officers, guilds and heretics. The richer persons living in cities and villages should be also made to pay a share of their wealth. The king should request his ministers, priests, allies and feudatories to cooperate in the work of filling up the depleted treasury.<sup>102</sup> *Sukranītisāra*<sup>103</sup> recommends that the king should draw upon the wealth of rich men in times of danger but return it along with interest when he is free from danger. Some of the epigraphic references to taxes actually levied show that the rulers were not slow in acting up to the advice of *Nītivākyāmrta*. We have no means to find out whether any king did actually return the money taken by him in emergencies.

No state in the middle ages, whether in the east or in the west took upon itself the functions of ministering to the welfare of subjects. Protection from internal dangers and external invasions was all that was attempted by any Government in that age. The North Indian rulers also did not attempt more than this. The skeleton budget of a subordinate ruler having an income of one lakh *Karṣa*, which the *Sukranītisāra*<sup>104</sup> gives shows an expenditure of 2400 *Karṣa* or less than 2½% expenditure on learning and education. Even such a provision

cannot be found in the budgets of European states in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D.

# REFERENCES TO CHAPTER XI

(Public Finance).

- 1 *Rāj* (GOS), p. 84.
  - 2 *Matsya Purāṇa* Ch. 217, verses 2-3 quoted in *Vīramitradaya Rājanītiprakāśa*, p. 198.
  - 3 *Rāj*, Ch. V.
  - 4 *Ibid*, pp. 88-92 quoting *Manu* VII. 127-132 and X. 118-120 *Viṣṇu* III. 22-27 and *Gautama* X. 30-33.
  - 5 *Mānasollāsa* (GOS, Vol. 84) *Viṃśati* II. 3. 163-164.
  - 6 *Manu* X. 118.
  - 7 *Kauṭīlya* V. 2.
  - 8 *Rājanītiratnākara* Ch. XII, p. 55. Also quoted in AR; p. 217.
  - 9 *Sukranītisāra* (ed. Sarkar), IV. 2. 120ff.
  - 10 Ghoshal: *Agrarian System in Ancient India*, p. 23.
  - 11 *Sukranītisāra* (ed. Cal), IV. 2. 114.
  - 12 IA. VI. 56; XVI. 203, 206, 208; XVIII. 17. 131; XXV. 207. EI. II. 360; III. 48; IV. 97-133; V. 49; X. 99; XI. 182; XVIII. 224, 299 and 323.
  - 13 IA. VI. 56; XVI. 203, 206, 208, 255; XVIII. 17. 131; XXV. 207, EI. II. 360, 363; III. 48; IV. 97-133; V. 49; X. 99; XI. 182; XVIII. 224, 299 and 323.
  - 14 IA. VI. 56; XVI. 203, 206 and 255; XVIII. 17; XXV. 207, EI. III. 48; XI. 182; XVIII. 299, 323 and IA. XIV. 103.
- The following forms of *bhūga*, *bhoga* and *hiraṇya* are written in the Gāhaḍavāla grants:
- Bhūgabhogakara* in Chandravati plates dated VS 1150 (EI. XIV. 195) and VS. 1156 (*Ibid* 199); Kamauli pl. dated VS. 1178 (EI. IV. 110); Benares dated V.S. 1203 (EI. VIII. 158); Badera dated V.S. 1164 (JUPHS XIV. 72).
- Bhūgabhogakarahiraṇya* in BAS grant dated V.S. 1154 (IA. XVIII. 12); Kamauli pl. dated V.S. 1198 (EI. IV. 113).
- Bhūgabhogakūṭaka* in Kamauli pls. dated V.S. 1162 (EI. II. 360) and V.S. 1191 (EI. IV. 132); Rahan grant V.S. 1166 (IA. XVIII. 17).
- Bhūgabhogapraṇanikara* in Chandravati grant (EI. IX. 305); Kamauli V.S. 1171 (EI. IV. 103); 1174 (*Ibid*. 106), 1175 (*Ibid* 107), 1176 (*Ibid*. 109); Don Buzurg (EI. XVIII. 222); Maner 1188 (JBORS II. 446); Kamauli V.S. 1184 (EI. IV. 111); J'aunja V.S. 1186 (*Ibid*. XIII. 297); Set Mahet, 1186 (*Ibid*. XI. 24); Pali, 1189 (*Ibid*. V. 114); Kamauli 1190 (*Ibid*. IV. 112); Benares, 1190 (*Ibid*. VIII. 156), 1196 (*Ibid*. II. 363); Kamauli 1196 (*Ibid*. IV. 114), Gagaha 1199 (*Ibid* XIII.

219); Machhlisahr, 1201 (*Ibid.* V. 116); Lar, 1202 (*Ibid.* VII. 100); Benares, 1207 (*Ibid.* VIII. 159); Bangavan 1208 (*Ibid.* V. 118) Kamauli 1221 (*Ibid.* IV. 120); Kamauli pls. 1226 (*Ibid.* IV. 1. 21) 1231 (IV. 126), 1232 (*Ibid.* IV. 128), Benares, 1232 (IA. 18. 131); BAS, 1233 (*Ibid.* XVIII. 136-137). 1234 and 1236 (IA. XVIII. 139, 142-143); Kamauli 1233 (EI. IV. 129), Bhadavana, 1184 (*Ibid.* XIX. 294); Lucknow Museum, 1237 (*Ibid.* 24. 295); Rajghat 1197 (*Ibid.* XXVI. 273); Machhlisahr 1253 (EI. X. 99).

*Bhāgabhogakaraprananikarakūtaka* in Kamauli V.S. 1172 (EI. IV. 104); Chhatarpur, 1177; Kamauli, 1182 and 1184 (EI. IV. 101, XXVI. 73).

*Bhāgabhogahiranyaprananikara* in Benares V.S. 1187 (EI. VIII. 154); Kamauli 1200 (*Ibid.* IV. 115), 1211 (*Ibid.* IV. 117), 1228 (*Ibid.* IV. 123), 1230 (*Ibid.* IV. 124).

15 *Struggle for Empire*, p. 319.

16 *Yāj.* II. 266.

17 *Manu* VIII. 398.

18 *Agni Purāṇa* Ch. 223. 23-24.

19 Sevadi SI. V.S. 1167/1110 A.D. (EI. XI. 30), Lalrai, V.S. 1233 (*Ibid.* XI. 49-50).

20 Nadlai SI V.S. 1189 (EI. XI. 34-36) and 1200 (*Ibid.* XI. 41).

21 Nadol pls. of Alpaṇadeva and Kīrtipāla (EI. IX. 66 and 69).

22 IA. XLI. (1912), p. 202 Cf. Nanana grant dated 1156 A.D. (ABORI 1941-42, p. 317)

23 EI. XXIII. 137.

24 *Ibid.* III. pp. 295-296.

25 *Ibid.* XIV, 295ff.

26 Ichchhawar pl. Jated V.S. 1228/1171 A.D. (IA. XXV. 207).

27 EI. II. 236.

28 *Mānasollāsa* (GOS. Vol. 28, p. 62) *Virṣati* II. 4. 374-376.

29 *Agni Purāṇa* Ch. 223, 24ff; *Mānasollāsa Virṣati*, II. 165-166; *Sukranūṭisāra*, IV. 2. 118-119 (ed. Cal.); *Rāj*; pp. 88-89.

30 *Rāj*; pp. 88-89 quoting *Manu* VII. 130 and *Viṣṇu* III. 408.

31 IA. VI. 56.

32 IA. XVIII. 17.

33 IA. XIV. 103. Also mentioned in *Gāhaḍavāla* grants along with *bhāgabhogā*, *hiranya* and *pravanikara*.

34 IA. XIV. 103 (Bashi pl. V.S. 1161).

35 *Ibid.*

36 IA. VI. 202.

37 EI. XIV. 300 (Arthuna inscr. verse 74).

38 EI. XI. 36.

39 *Ibid.* XI. 42-43.

40 *Sukranūṭisāra* (ed. Cal.), IV. 2. 129.

41 *Mārgadāya Kauptika* in Somanatha Temple-inscr. (EI. XXIII. 131); *Rāsmālā* (ed. Rawlinson), p. 235.

- 42 EI. XIV. 184; IA. VI. 204.
- 43 EI. XI. 59.
- 44 *Ibid.* XXI. 48-49 (Panahera inscr.).
- 45 IA. XLI. 20 (Anavada stone inscr. of V.S. 1348).
- 46 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.), IV. 2. 129.
- 47 EI. XIV. 300. (Arthuna inscr. verses 73 and 74).
- 48 IA. IV. 269.
- 49 IA. XXXI. 483, *Sukritasāṅkīrtana*, verses 39-43; *Prābandha-Chintāmaṇi* (ed. and Trs. Tawney), p. 133.
- 50 *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, IV. 4. 3. 13; *Maitr. Sam.*, IV. 6. 4. *Baudhāyana*, XI. 2. 53; *Vaśiṣṭha*, XVII. 62.
- 51 *Aparārka*, p. 745.
- 52 *Yasāhpāla*: *Moharājaparājaya*, Act III. Verse 50; *Kumārapālpratibodha*, pp. 48; *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tr. Tawney), p. 133.
- 53 EI. VI. 28.
- 54 IA. XVIII. 131. and XXV. 207.
- 55 *Daśuparādha* in IA. XIV. 103. and XVIII. 16.
- Pratyādāya* in EI. XIV. 195. Cf. Kauṭilya IX. 4, which according to Dr. U. N. Ghoshal signifies "a loan which is to be returned and which was levied in emergencies".
- 56 EI. IV. 124 (Kamauli pl. dated V.S. 1230)
- 57 IA. XVIII. 17 (Rahan grant).
- 58 EI. XIII. 219; VIII. 158; IV. 120 and X. 99.
- 59 EI. X. 99.
- 60 *Viṣayadāna*—EI. XIV. 195 (Chandravati pl. V.S. 1150)
- 61 Kauṭilya, II. 15 and *Śukranītisāra*, IV. 2. 10 ed. Cal).
- 62 IA. XIV. 103 (Basahi, V.S. 1161) and EI. II. 360 (Kamauli V.S. 1162).
- 63 DHNI. VOL. II, 1113.
- 64 EI. XIV. 300 (Arthuna inscr., verse 75).
- 65 *Rāj.* p. 93.
- 66 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal. p. 163). II. 273.
- 67 RC. II. 40.
- 68 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal) IV. 2. 9. *anāpadi na kurvīta tīrtha-devakaragrahat*.
- 69 *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tr. Tawney), p. 84.
- 70 IA. XXXI. 483.
- 71 RT. VII. 1008.
- 72 IB. III, p. 21, line 30.
- 73 Sen B. C.; *Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal*, p. 552; IC. VII. 311.
- 74 EI. IX. 305; IA. XVIII. 17 (Rahan, V.S. 1166); EI. IV. 106 and 109 (Kamauli V.S. 1174 and 1176); EI. VIII. 156. (Benares 1190); EI. IV. 114, 117, 120 and 124 (Kamauli V.S. 1197, 1211, 1221 and 1230).
- 75 IA. XVIII. 137, 139, 140 and 143 (BAS, V.S. 1233, 1234 and

1236); EI. IV. 129 (Kamauli, V.S. 1233); EI. XXIV. 295 (Lucknow Museum, V.S. 1237).

76 IA. XVIII. 142 and 143 (BAS. V.S. 1236).

77 IA. XIV. 103 (Basahi V.S. 1161).

78 *Gokara*—EI. XIII. 219 (Gagaha, V.S. 1199); VIII. 158 (Benares, V.S. 1203) and IV. 120 (Kamauli, V.S. 1221).

*Pravanikara*—IA. XVIII. 131; EI. II. 263; IV. 97ff; V. 49; VII. 98-100, IX. 305, XVIII. 224 and XIX. 293.

*Cf. Pratisiddhāya*—IA. XIX. 164 mentioned in a Chaulukya inscr. dated 1040 A.D.

79 Chandravati grant V.S. 1148 (EI. IX. 305); *ibid.* V.S. 1150, and 1156 (EI. XIV. 195 and 199); Basahi V.S. 1161 (IA. XIV. 103) Kamauli, V.S. 1162 (EI. II. 360); Badera V.S. 1164 (JUPHS. XIV 72); Rahan, V.S. 1166 (IA. XVIII. 17); Kamauli, V.S. 1174 (EI. IV. 106); V.S. 1176 (EI. IV. 109); Benares V.S. 1181 (JASB. LVI. Pt. I. 113-18), BAS. V.S. 1182 (JASB. XXVII. 241ff); Maner V.S. 1183 (JBORS. II. 446) Itaunja, V.S. 1186 (EI. XIII. 297); Set Mahet V.S. 1186 (EI. XI. 24); Benares, V.S. 1187 (EI. VIII. 154); Kamauli V.S. 1190 (EI. IV. 112); Benares V.S. 1190 (EI. VIII. 156) and V.S. 1196 (EI. II. 363) Kamauli V.S. 1197 (EI. IV. 114); Rajghat pl. V.S. 1197 (EI. XXVI. 273); Benares V.S. 1190 (EI. VIII. 156) and V.S. 1196 (EI. II. 363); Kamauli V.S. 1198 (EI. IV. 113); Gagaha V.S. 1199 (EI. XIII. 219); Machhliisahr, V.S. 1201 (EI. V. 116); Lar, V.S. 1202 (EI. VII. 100); Benares V.S. 1203 (EI. VIII. 158); 1207 (*ibid.* 159) Kamauli V.S. 1211 (EI. IV. 117) and 1221 (EI. IV. 120); BAS. V.S. 1221 (EI. IV. 120); BAS. V.S. 1225 (IA. XV. 7-13).

80 AR. pp. 365-367.

81 *Sukranitisāra* (ed. Cal.), IV. 2. 127.

82 IA. XVIII. 12 (BAS. grant dated V.S. 1154/1097 A.D. lines 16-17).

83 EI. XXI. 93 and 96 (Jubbulpur inscr. dated K.S. 918/1167 A.D.).

84 EI. XI. 47.

85 Bhavnagar Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions, p. 158.

86 RT. VIII. 1953.

87 *Ibid.* VII. 110.

88 *Ibid.* VII. 122.

89 *Ibid.* VII. 203.

90 *Ibid.* VII. 214.

91 *Ibid.* VII. 1088.

92 *Ibid.* 1102.

93 *Ibid.* 1107.

94 *Ibid.* VII. 1225.

95 *Ibid.* VII. 1227.

96 *Ibid.* VIII. 492.



- 97 *Ibid.* VIII. 565-568.
- 98 *Ibid.* VIII. 1428.
- 99 *Ibid.* VIII. 2224.
- 100 *Ibid.* VIII. 2226.
- 101 *Ibid.* VIII. 2229.
- 102 *Nītivākyāmr̥itam* (p. 82) Ch. XXI.
- 103 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.), IV. 2. 11.
- 104 *Ibid.* (ed. Cal.) IV. 7. 25-27.

## CHAPTER XII

### Daily life of the People

Insecurity characterised the daily life of the people of Northern India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. The sacking of cities like Mathura, Kanauj, Somanatha and Banaras by the Turko-Afghan invaders left a trail of misery behind for a pretty long time. The insane craze for glory which actuated the princes to undertake frequent expeditions added to the misery of the people. Sacking of cities was very common. We cite here only a few examples. Paramāra Bhoja's general Kulachandra sacked Anahilapāṭaka.<sup>1</sup> Someśvara I of Kalyāṇa avenged the invasion of the Chaulukya kingdom by plundering Dhara, Ujjain and Mandu in the middle of the eleventh century A.D. Anantavarman Chodagaṅga devastated and burnt the fortified town of Āramya.<sup>2</sup> Yaśaḥ Karṇa sacked Champaran<sup>3</sup> in North Bihar. In Kashmir several times rebels burnt and pillaged cities and villages.<sup>4</sup> The result of one of these outbreaks of fire is vividly described by Kalhaṇa. "In the city (of Srinagara) which was reduced to a heap of earth", writes Kalhaṇa, "there remained visible and aloft only the single great Buddha (statue) which, blackened by smoke and without its abode, resembled a burned tree." The people crossed at that time the bridges over the streams holding their noses, on account of the stench produced by the decomposing corpses which had swollen in the water. The ground which was white everywhere owing to its being covered with the fragments of skulls from fleshless human skeletons, seemed to observe, as it were, "the custom of skull-carrying ascetics".<sup>5</sup> Fire consumed the granaries. Famine appeared in its wake. "The famishing people, who could scarcely walk, and whose tall bodies were emaciated and darkened by the sun-heat, appeared like scorched (wooden) posts."<sup>6</sup>

The soldiers marching through villages of their own kingdom were legally entitled to free service of villagers and also

supplies of food and fodder unless of course the village has been specially granted exemption from *chāṭa-bhaṭa*. An invading army seldom respected the private ownership of the crops standing in the fields of the country through which the general led an expedition. Life and property lay at the mercy of conquerors, exacting officers of one's kingdom and also of the unsocial elements in the community.

### *Cities :*

Capital towns, according to the *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*<sup>7</sup> must have access to water and possess forts, temples and houses of merchants. The *Agni Purāṇa* and the *Śukranītisāra*<sup>8</sup> prescribe that towns should be situated where there is plenty of water. This is why we find that in Kashmir, Gujarat, Bengal, Bihar and in the Uttar Pradesh, the well-known towns, like Srinagara, Barahamula, Sankarapura, Anhilwara, Broach, Cambay, Dholka, Kotivarsa, Tamralipta, Pundravardhana, Patna, Monghyr, Bhagalpur, Kanauj, Mathura, and Banaras were all situated on the sea or river.

The cities were not only centres of administration but also of trade and commerce. They were military bases<sup>9</sup> as well. Some of them lost their importance for political reasons. Manyakheta, which received much praise as a city from the Arab chroniclers like Al Mas'ūdī (943 A.D.) and Ibn Haukal (968-976 A.D.), was sacked by Taila II in 972 A. D. Sultān Mahmūd destroyed beautiful cities like Bairat in Kashmir, Thaneswar in Uttar Pradesh and Narain near modern Jaipur. In Bengal, Somapura, which was once a famous seat of learning, was burnt down by the Vaṅgāla army.<sup>10</sup> These cities never again rose to prominence.

A number of new towns arose during the period under review. In Kashmir, Varāhamūla, Bhuṭṭapura and Ratnapura were founded respectively by a king, a minister and a queen.<sup>11</sup> The other new cities in Northern India were Champāpura and Chandpur in the Chamba valley<sup>12</sup> and Garhwal districts, Ajayameru<sup>13</sup> in Rajputana, Asawal<sup>14</sup> or Ahmedabad, Karnāvati<sup>15</sup>

or Karanbel. Kakkareḍikā<sup>16</sup> or modern Kakreri in Rewah, Prahādanapura<sup>17</sup> or Palanpur (54 miles south of Mt. Abu in Gujarat). Tuṁmāna in Madhya Pradesh, Rāmāvati, Skandanagara and Lakhanauli,<sup>18</sup> in Bengal. Amongst these, Varāhamūla<sup>19</sup>, Ratnapura, Rāmāvati and Lakṣmaṇāvati all stood on the banks of famous rivers like the Vitastā, and the Gangū. Feudal chiefs selected places like Tuṁmāna, Kakkareḍikā as their capital. Varāhamūla and Asawal were important centres of trade.

These towns were administered by Government officials who are mentioned in early *smṛti* works like Manu<sup>20</sup> and later works like *Śukranītisāra*<sup>21</sup>. The highest official was called the city-prefect.<sup>22</sup> The town prefects were helped by a committee, as in ancient India.<sup>23</sup> It appears from inscriptions that the members of the *Pañchakula* or the committee of five in Siyadoni, Srimal and Satyapura<sup>24</sup> in Rajputana and Jhansi areas in the tenth and twelfth centuries A.D. All these non-officials were appointed by the kings or respective feudatory chiefs.<sup>25</sup> The Vaillabhattasvamin temple-inscription of Gwalior informs us that amongst the administrators of the city of Gopagiri (*i.e.*, Gwalior) were merchants like Vavviyaka and Ichchhuvāka.<sup>26</sup>

The Naḍol inscription dated V.S. 1198/c. 1141 A.D. informs us that the town of Dhalepa<sup>27</sup> had a very good and efficient police system. The town was divided into eight wards and each ward used to send two Brāhmaṇa representatives. These sixteen aldermen were provided with arms by the feudatory chief Rāyapāla. They promised solemnly that they would try to find out by means of *Chaukadika* (*pañchāyat*) system whatever was lost on the way. Brāhmaṇas too were required to help the representatives of the wards in finding out the lost property.

It seems that the main function of the city prefects and the committees of towns in Rajputana, Kashmir and Ajaigadh in the kingdom of the Chandellas, was mainly to detect thieves, recover stolen goods and perform such other types of police

duties. Hariṣeṇa in his *Bṛhatkathākoṣa*, compiled in the tenth century A.D. describes the police functions of *Talara* or the city prefect. The term *Talara* has been explained by Hemachandra as the city-superintendent of police in the *Deśināma-mālā*.<sup>29</sup> One of the stories of Hariṣeṇa relates how the Mayor of the town himself concealed a thief. In Rajputana and Gujarat, the permission of the *Pañchakula* was necessary for purchase of lands. They helped in the financing of temples.<sup>30</sup>

Popularly elected municipal bodies looking after the sanitation, transport, water-supply etc. were absent in our period. It was the duty of the government to look after these functions. We find, however, that the authorities of Srinagara did not make any arrangement to remove the decomposed corpses lying in the river during a famine, which followed the great conflagration<sup>31</sup> in 1123 A.D.

Every town was provided with temples, tanks wells, markets and other amenities of life.<sup>32</sup> And almost all the towns were surrounded with walls or ditches. Muslim writers have testified to the massive ramparts and adequate protective arrangements for all important towns in Northern India like, Bhatia, Bhimnagar, Mathura, Kanauj, Anhilwara etc.<sup>33</sup> A massive wall was erected by King Kumārapāla of Gujarat round Ānandapura<sup>34</sup> (modern Vaḍnagar) before 1151 A.D. "Deep foundations", the Vaḍnagar inscription describes. "great extent, ornamental projections, looking like monkeys' heads in the copings of bricks, circular in shape, the stone-head is white with stucco."

Within these enclosed cities lived all classes of people, the men of the three upper castes, physicians, merchants, artisans, tailors, musicians, fishermen, washermen, and other manual labourers. In view of the direct evidences of Lakṣmīdhara<sup>35</sup>, the Gāhaḍavāla Prime Minister, and the authors of *Śukranītisāra* and *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*<sup>36</sup> we cannot agree with Profs. Habib and Yusuf Hussain that the Indian workers lived outside the cities in the period before the advent of the Turko-Afghans.<sup>37</sup> Dancers and musicians, who were

looked down upon by legists, had a place in the city. Both Lakṣmīdhara and Bhoja tell us that they had a particular share in the festival of the raising of the flagstaff of Indra<sup>38</sup>, which was carried according to the dictates of the king. In almost all important cities, even in the famous city of Pāṭaliputra, a seat of learning,<sup>39</sup> lived prostitutes.<sup>40</sup> Chāṇḍ Baradāyī tells us that when one entered Kanauj, one could see the gambling house, dance of prostitutes and rich markets full of dealers in gold, jewelleries and clothes.<sup>41</sup> This is however a conventional description and it can be fairly compared with the observations of Yuan Chwang on the same city. Rāmāvatī in North Bengal and Ānandapura in Northern Gujarat though separated by more than a thousand miles, resembled each other in the twelfth century A.D. Compare for example, the description of Ānandapura as given in the *Vaḍnagur Praśasti*<sup>42</sup> with that of Rāmāvatī as depicted in *Rāmācharita*. The former Praśasti states: "loud noise of the Vedas (recited) by crowds of untired Brāhmiṇs defends him, because the smoke of the fires, (blazing up) with uninterrupted oblations—Kali does not roam here because, the blows from the tips of the flags (raised) on numerous temples of the gods, lame him. The city's streets resplendent with the rays of jewels in the various ornaments of Brāhmiṇs' wives taking their walks and made noisy by auspicious sounds of uninterrupted songs." Sandhyākaranandī describes Rāmāvatī as a city "which rivalled Amarāvatī, which was resonant with the music of tabor of many varieties that was (specially) practised in Varendrī, which was peopled by learned men devoted to truth and which was without any obstacles.... which was the home of pious souls, having no talk about any unfair transaction or litigation, which city, through its great figures known in history, assured security to all, and which had a series of lofty temples of gods.... a city of rows of palaces with plenty of gold therein, and therefore, made it appear like the peak of the Meru."<sup>43</sup> A similar description is given of Pravara-pura in the *Vikramāṅkadevacharita*.<sup>44</sup> A

vivid description of the town of Ajmer has been given in the *Prthvīrajaviṣaya*.<sup>45</sup> The residents of cities used camphor and musk.<sup>46</sup> They lived in houses which had more than two storeys. Sometimes clock-towers<sup>47</sup> were erected.

Unlike the modern cities of India, mediaeval Indian cities had adequate pasture lands and a considerable proportion of agricultural population.<sup>48</sup> A side light on city-life is thrown by Medhātithi while explaining *Manu* VII. 13. In citing examples of orders issued by the King he states: "Today the city should observe a holiday—there is a marriage in the minister's house—all men should be present there." This shows how the subjects had to regulate their business in accordance with the whims and caprices of the King. The city which Medhātithi has in view must have rather a small population. The minister would have found it impossible to move about if fifty thousand or so of the townsmen had turned up at his house.

### *Village life :*

Villages were more or less self-contained. Daily necessities of life could be procured in big villages. The Nagari plates<sup>49</sup> of Anangabha III of Orissa, dated 1230 A.D. reveal that in the villages Pūrṇagrāma and Jayanagaragrāma in the Śailo-ṣṣaya lived a number of merchants such as a perfumer, a worker or dealer in conchshells, a splitter of wood, a goldsmith and a worker in bell-metal. There were three sellers of betel leaves, one florist, one manufacturer of raw sugar, at least one milkman, two weavers, one oilman, two potters, one washerman, a few craftsmen and three fishermen. As the persons mentioned in this inscription may be taken to be above thirty years of age, their names will show what types of name were given to simple village-folks in Orissa towards the end of the twelfth century. These were Vapuli, Nārāyaṇa, Dāmodara, Mādhava, Chitra, Soma, Valhū, Keśava, Mahādeva, Narasimha, Śiva, Mahānanda, Irandu, Mantū, Dhīru, Gobhī, Nāgu, Jagai, Gānu, Śūnya, Arjuna,

Visu, Rāju, Vāsu, and Padma. The preponderance of names synonymous with Visu is worth noticing.

The male folk of the villages were simple. Poets like Yogeśvara and Śubhāṅka tell us that the male liberties of the village, without the sophisticated manners of the city-dwellers, on seeing a woman, ascend the tree-tops, jump across the well, show valour by overturning the bullock-cart and try to attract the lady by singing in a low voice.<sup>50</sup> Sometimes in the month of *Chaitra*, they would try to kiss the women while they were asleep in the open.<sup>51</sup> The prayer of a rich farmer was that the local officer may be without any greed, cattle in plenty may purify the house, that cultivation may be fruitful and the housewife may be untiring in their entertainment of guests.<sup>52</sup> A lively picture of the happy peasant-proprietor has been drawn by Śarana, the Court Poet of King Lakṣmanasena, in these words:<sup>53</sup> "Here the ladies are walking fast; their eyes are as red as the setting sun; as they are moving rapidly the scarf is falling down again and again and they are picking it up every time. They are traversing the path as quickly as possible because those peasants who have gone out to the fields in the morning will return to their homes shortly. And yet in such a condition they are busy in counting on fingers the money on the sale proceeds and also the amount spent in making purchases in the market." This poem leaves no doubt in the mind of readers about the total absence of *purdah* but not of veils amongst the women belonging to the agricultural classes.

#### *Amusements and Drama :*

Dramatic performances were extremely popular during the period under survey. Dramas were staged before the kings, aristocrats as well as the common people. The themes were mostly drawn from epics and *Purāṇas*, as for example, Rāma, Nala or the fight between Indra and Kṛṣṇa for the Pārijāta, the celestial flower. Some of them were drawn from court life, as for example, the marriages of Karna, the King of Guja-



rat, Arjunavarman, the Paramāra King, and Visaladeva, the Chāhamāna King, in the *Karnasundarī*, *Pārijātamañjarī* and *Lalitavigraharājanātaka* respectively. Others depict undesirable characters like rogues in *Laṭakamelaka* of Kavirāja Śaikhadhara and robbers like Rauhineya in *Prabuddharauhineya*. Besides these, there were also allegorical plays like the *Prabodhachandrodaya* and the *Moharājaparājaya*.<sup>54</sup> The dramatists hailed from different parts of Northern India for example, Kṣemendra and Bilhaṇa from Kashmir, Visaladeva and Somadeva from Rajputana, Rāmachandra and Yaśaḥpāla, the authors of *Nalavilāsa*, *Nirbhayabhīma* and *Moharājaparājaya* from Gujarat area; Vatsarāja, Madana Bālasarasvatī, Kṛṣṇamiśra from Mid-India and Umāpatidhara author of *Pārijāta-haraṇa* from Bengal and Kavirāja Śaikhadhara from the Uttar Pradesh. Some amongst these authors were kings like Visaladeva, the Chāhamāna King of Śakambharī and feudatories like Vastupāla of Rajputana.

The venue of dramatic performances was either the palaces of kings<sup>55</sup> or temples. We do not find any special principle for building an auditorium either in ancient or in mediæval India. But it is likely that like other stages, the theatre was rectangular, "the stage being at the end of a short side".<sup>56</sup> Inscriptions show that dramas were staged in some Hindu and Jaina temples.<sup>57</sup> The Jalor inscription<sup>58</sup> states that in V.S. 1268/c. 1210 A.D. in a central hall of a Jaina temple dramatic performances were held under the direction of Rāmachandrāchārya. The Anavada inscription,<sup>59</sup> on the other hand, records that when the gifts made by various persons, merchants, and ship-owners were found insufficient for the expenses of the worship and theatricals in honour of Kṛṣṇa, the citizens of Prahlādanapura voluntarily agreed to pay taxes on the necessities of life.

Sometimes dramatic performances were arranged in the open air. Kalhaṇa<sup>60</sup> hints at such an arrangement. "Thereupon when the king (Harṣa) was about to move (in that direction) his force dispersed in all directions, just like people

caught by a downpour while watching a theatrical performance."

In these performances there were both male and female participants. In contrast to pre-Restoration England where boys were trained to represent women,<sup>61</sup> the parts of women were played by women actresses in India from the time of the composition of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*.<sup>62</sup> It is also interesting to record that in ancient and early mediæval India, sometimes women played the rôle of male actors.<sup>63</sup> Of course, usually some of these actresses were wives of the actors.

Though the actors and actresses, as a community, were looked down upon in ancient India and the period under survey, they were honoured by kings.<sup>64</sup> Lakṣmīdhara, quoting *Brahma Purāṇa*, tells us that on the occasion of festivals in honour of deities, the king was to witness dramatic performances on every third day. To the ordinary actors, the king was required to give money according to their ability. The director of the play was to be honoured with betelnuts and flowers.<sup>65</sup>

The theatre was thus patronised by the kings and common people. A story of the king attending the shows along with commoners is recorded by Merutuṅga. Siddharāja, the Chaulukya King of Gujarat, while witnessing a drama in the Karṇameru palace\*, found to his great surprise that an ordinary merchant, dealing in check-peas, placed his hands on the royal shoulder and offered betels to the King.

However, the common people shared the joys in such theatrical performances. In the *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacharita*, Hemachandra writes of the town and village folk laughing on seeing "fat men, men with projecting teeth, lame men, hunchbacks, flatnosed men, men with dishevelled hair, bald men, one-eyed men, and other deformed men; by ash-coloured men; by men with buttock bells, by musicians of the arm-pit

\* *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Translation of Tawney, p. 106, and Singhi Jain Series, p. 84). Tawney refers to Karṇameru as a temple and Hazari Prasad Dwivedi as a palace.

and the nose, by dancers of the ear and brow, by imitators of other people".<sup>66</sup> Thus, unlike the English drama of the Restoration period, the Indian drama was neither localized in the capital nor did it cater to the taste only of the Court and the fashionable people of towns.

### *Dancing and Musical Instruments :*

In course of dramatic performances a spectator could see plenty of dancing and hear songs accompanied by musical instruments. Dancers thronged also in the temple courtyard and the palace of the king.<sup>67</sup> Kings were patrons of music. Someśvara, the Chālukya King, was himself an eminent authority on music,<sup>68</sup> and such was his fondness for it that he recommended that the subject of debate between two logicians should be vocal or instrumental music or dancing.<sup>69</sup> Kalaśa developed a taste for choral songs (*upāṅga-gīta*) for the first time in Kashmir.<sup>70</sup> The instruments, which we find mentioned during our period, were also known in much earlier periods, e.g., lute, drums, flutes, trumpets, gongs, cymbals, kettle-drums, tabors<sup>71</sup> etc.

### *Games :*

Most of the indoor and outdoor games have a long history. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D., adults and children took part in games, which can be traced in the *Kāma-sūtra* of Vātsyāyana and *Daśakumāracharita* of Daṇḍin.

Duels, wrestling, fighting with a sham stick, polo and something like hockey were played by sturdy young boys. Both in Kashmir and in Mid-India duels were encouraged by the kings.<sup>72</sup> But while in Kashmir, the combatants' duel was encouraged by the King Uchchala specially on monthly reception days and other festivals like Indra-festivals, King Someśvara Chālukya allowed it only on Saturdays and when the contestants refused to settle the quarrel without any fight. In both the places the kings are known to have given rewards to the victors. The victorious wrestlers were also

rewarded with dress, ornaments, vehicles, or horses.<sup>73</sup> Wrestling is as old as Pāṇini (*Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 3.3.36) and early Buddhist literature.<sup>74</sup> The game of polo, which was previously unknown, was popular in the Chaulukya kingdom.<sup>75</sup> The editor of *Mānasollāsa* informs us that the Polo game differed from the Afghan and Mughal Polo in "having two sets of goals" and "the ball is made of *Pāribhadra* tree".<sup>76</sup> Hockey seems to have cropped up in Gujarat slightly earlier to our period.<sup>77</sup> If we are to believe in the information given by Abhayatilaka Gaṇi, the commentator of Hemachandra's *Dvyāśraya*, the game was familiar in the Mathura region. He tells us that Śrīkrṣṇa played this game<sup>78</sup> in his early life.

Another popular outdoor game for grown-up boys and girls was playing with a ball.<sup>79</sup> The participants of *charchari* dance were exclusively ladies.<sup>80</sup> On this occasion the richly attired ladies sprinkled one another with water. It was of course distinct from water-sport, which was known in India from a very early period.<sup>81</sup> The swings or *dolāvilāsa*, specially during the spring season, afforded good opportunity to the young men and women to express their sentiment of love. Hemachandra gives a graphic description of the lovers. Songs enlivened this amusement. Some of the young beautiful ladies, swung up and down, and their anklets rang in unison.<sup>82</sup>

Among indoor games, the most ancient and yet extremely popular in the period under survey, were dice and chess.<sup>83</sup> Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, on the basis of *Moharājaparājayā*<sup>84</sup>, refers to five varieties of gambling for different sections of the community, like kings, millionaires, merchants and even small boys.<sup>85</sup> Though the *smṛtis* prohibited gambling as early as Manu yet people played it. The law-givers themselves permitted the play with dice on the occasion of the worship of Lakshmi on the first day of the bright-half of the month of *Kārtika*.<sup>87</sup> However, it is necessary to mention here that of all contemporary kings, Kumārapāla made earnest efforts to stop gambling with dice.<sup>88</sup>

Besides dice, boys and girls played ancient games like hide

and seek, odd and even,<sup>89</sup> which are also played in modern India.

Amusements exclusively for women were playing with dolls and sometimes with strings attached to them.<sup>90</sup> *Karkaraka*, which meant throwing of pebbles in the air<sup>91</sup> and *Navālava*, a sort of religious spring festival, during which women not giving out their husbands' names were beaten by other married ladies with creepers of *Palāśa*.<sup>92</sup>

A detailed account of other expensive and royal amusements and pastimes occurs in the *Mānasollāsa*. Sri G. K. Shrigondekar, the editor of the *Mānasollāsa*, has given a lucid and long description of the sport with elephants, *birudūnka* or riding a buffalo with a burning torch even during the day, cock-fight (*tāmrachūḍavinoda*), amusements of quails (*lāvakavinoda*), ram-fight (*meṣayuddha*), buffalo-fight (*mahiṣavinoda*), pigeon-flight (*pārūvatavinoda*), amusements with dogs (*sārameyavinoda*), hawking (*śyenavinoda*), angling (*matsyavinoda*), hunting (*mṛgaya*) and hunting leopards (*vyāghrajā*). As many as twenty-one kinds of hunting are described in the *Mānasollāsa*. All the above-mentioned sports are also mentioned in other literary compositions. The fights of birds, elephants, cocks, rams, buffaloes, quails<sup>93</sup>, pigeon-flights<sup>94</sup>, hunting, hawking and angling<sup>95</sup> are referred to in other earlier works like the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, *Mṛcchakaṭika* or *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣaśharita* and *Hamṁīramahākāvya*.

Thus most of the games of early mediæval India were practised as early as the time of Pāṇini and Vātsyāyana. Some of the ancient institutions like *Samājas*<sup>96</sup>, *Sannivesa*<sup>97</sup>, chariot race, which became obsolete by the time of Aśoka or early centuries of the Christian era were not revived. Moreover, some of the amusements like *Viśakhadikā*, *Aśokattarṁśikā*, *Puṣpavācayika*, *Damanabhañjika* etc. which by the fourth century A.D. had begun to be counted as festivals, continued to please the people even during the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. Only Polo and hockey may be said to be the legacy of the eleventh century to modern India.

*Food and Drink :*

Wheat is known to have been cultivated in India as early as the age of *Vājasaneyī-Saṁhitā* (XVIII, 12). But it was not and even today is not used in many parts of India. In 851 A.D. Sulaiman noted that "rice is the most common food of the Indians who eat no wheat".<sup>98</sup> Dr. Ghoshal has quoted the authority of the *Vaijayantī* to show that wheat was treated as food fit for Mlechchhas.<sup>99</sup> But it may be pointed out that Yādavaprakāśa, the author of *Vaijayantī*, was born near Kanchipuram and that the South is still reluctant to take wheat. So far as North India is concerned Lakṣmīdhara's frequent references to the consumption of *godhūma* on festive occasions leave no doubt about the popularity of wheat in the Uttar Pradesh in the twelfth century. He recommends the use of wheat preparations on the *Janmāṣṭamī*<sup>100</sup>, on the ninth day of the bright-half of the month of *Bhādra*<sup>101</sup> and many other occasions. Wheat was offered to the Jaina deity in Rajputana.<sup>102</sup> Hemachandra refers to the use of wheat flower in the preparation of sweets.<sup>103</sup> The use of *Karoṭī* which is explained by the commentator as powdered wheat baked in fire occurs in the *Rāmacharita*.<sup>104</sup> The word *Roṭī* seems to have been derived from *Karoṭī*. The *Bhāva-prakāśa* uses the word *Roṭika* itself.

All over Northern India, we find that the most popular articles of diet were rice, fruits, vegetables and milk. Ibn Masah of the tenth century records that the people of Gujarat believed that the use of rice and cow's milk as the only items of food which prolong longevity, prevents the onset of old age and gives good complexion.<sup>105</sup> Rice was also the principal food of the people of Kashmir and the Uttar Pradesh. Śrīharsa refers to the serving of rice "unbroken, entire and crisp, with vapour playing over it," on the occasion of feeding the guests in the marriage ceremony of Nala and Damayanti.<sup>106</sup> The *Prākṛta Paṁgala* tells us that a fortunate housewife serves hot rice on green plantain leaf with cow's *ghee*, fish and *Nālitā* vegetable to her husband daily. In Gujarat the varied types

of dishes were prepared from rice mixed with sesamum and milk, curds, and spices.<sup>107</sup> Hemachandra also notes that *Pāruallo* or rice parched and flattened was a favourite dish.<sup>108</sup> Milk rice was one of the favourite meals of the people of the U. P. and Bengal.<sup>109</sup> In Orissa, rice cooked with curd and *ghee* was offered to the gods.<sup>110</sup>

It is rather strange that though milk and its various preparations were popular in India. Bhavadeva prohibited its use in expiatory ceremonies.<sup>111</sup>

Amongst the different kinds of pulse used by North Indians, particularly Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh and Gujarat were *kulattha*, *chana*, *masūra*, *mudga* or *phaseolus mungo*.<sup>112</sup>

#### *Forbidden Vegetarian Food :*

Lakṣmīdhara and Chaṇḍeśvara, quoting earlier authorities, have given a long list of forbidden food.<sup>113</sup> Among these the most important are onions and garlic, rice with meat (*palāṇḍu*), *vārtāku*, bottle gourd (*alābu*), a fungus which looks like an umbrella-shaped flower (*kavaka*), *vajraphalī* reed plant (*nala* or *kalambikī*) cocoanut (*nālikera*), *śvetavrintāka* or *śvetavārtāku*, a species of *kadamba*, *kumbhāṇḍa* or *kumbhālu*, *kuchunda* or *kuvrinda*, *parārika* or a kind of *palāṇḍu*, *nālikāśāku*, rice boiled with *tila* or sesamum (*kṛsara*), powdered wheat boiled with *ghee* and boiled milk (*sañyāva*), mungo pulses cooked in sesamum oil (*śaskulī*), powdered wheat or barley (*saktū*) mixed with curd.<sup>114</sup> The juice of sugarcane was also forbidden. The taking of *masūra* pulses was allowed only in times of distress.<sup>115</sup> These restrictions apply mostly to a microscopic minority in the community, namely, the orthodox Brāhmaṇas. We find that barley was used in Kashmir<sup>116</sup> and Rajputana.<sup>117</sup> In spite of the *śāstric* injunctions, the people of Kashmir used onions, which was even offered to the *gurus*<sup>118</sup> or preceptors. Bengalees felt no hesitation in using cocoanuts.<sup>119</sup>

#### *Fish :*

With regard to fish, we find that it was eaten practically all over Northern India. In Bengal, Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, Jīmū-

tavāhana, Śrīnāthāchārya and others allowed the eating of fish on some festive (*parvan*) days. But they prohibit the use of those fishes which have ugly forms or have heads like snakes, which live in holes and are without any spine.<sup>120</sup> Sarvānanda informs us that the people of Vaṅgāla like dried fish.<sup>121</sup> Almost a similar attitude to the taking of fish is found in Lakṣmīdhara's *Niyatakālakāṇḍa*. He quotes *Manu* V. 16 and *Yājñavalkya* 1. 177-178 and states that even a Brāhmaṇa may offer *pāṭhūna* and *rohita*, and all other fishes which had spines and *rājīva* and *siṃhaṭuṇḍa*.<sup>122</sup> Kavirāja Śaṅkhaḍhara, who composed the *Laṭakamelaka* under Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla, tells us that Madanamañjarī, daughter of Daṇṭūra, swallowed a fish bone. It was only by conversations and actions of the quack-doctor Jantuketu that the bone could be dislodged.<sup>123</sup> Thus the statements of Lakṣmīdhara and the author of *Laṭakamelaka* show that the people of the Uttar Pradesh were not vegetarians. In Kashmir as well as in the kingdom of Someśvara, the author of *Mānasollāsa*, fish was served to the people.<sup>124</sup> The Kashmiris considered fish-broth as a tonic.<sup>125</sup> Only in contemporary Gujarati literature we do not find any mention of fish as an article of food, because the Jaina element was exceptionally strong there.

### *Meat :*

Lakṣmīdhara and Chaṇḍeśvara allow the Brāhmaṇas as well as other members of the community to take meat, provided they are offered beforehand to the gods and manes. It was also permissible for a sick person to take meat.<sup>126</sup> The tenor of the writing of Lakṣmīdhara shows that meat was normally taken on all the days excepting some special occasions like the full moon day of *Āśvina*, when it is distinctly stated that the food should be without any meat.<sup>127</sup> In Bengal, the flesh of deer, goat, hare, godha, porcupine and tortoise could be eaten, but not snails, crabs, fowls, cranes, ducks, *datyāha* birds, camels, boars, cows etc.<sup>128</sup> In Kashmir



not only fowl, ram and goats, but also domesticated pigs were taken by the people.<sup>129</sup> In Mid-India it seems from *Mānasollāsa* that the meat of boar, deer, hare, sheep, goat, birds, fish, tortoises, crabs and even rats were taken by kings.<sup>130</sup> An inscription of Bhoja records that Brāhmaṇas took meat.<sup>131</sup> Different preparations of meat and rice and other grains, are mentioned by Kalhaṇa and Lakṣmīdhara.<sup>132</sup> Hemachandra refers to roasted meat or something like *shik-kabūb* taken by his countrymen.<sup>133</sup> The preparations of meat are also referred to in the *Naiṣadhacharita* and inscriptions.<sup>134</sup>

In this connection it would be interesting to record that there is a good deal of agreement between Lakṣmīdhara and Alberuni regarding the list of animals, whose flesh was not permitted to be taken, as for example, cows, horses, mules, asses, camels, elephants, tame poultry, crows, parrots and nightingales.<sup>135</sup>

It is curious to note that while *Mānasollāsa* states that the king may take flesh of rats, such a thing is distinctly forbidden by Lakṣmīdhara.<sup>136</sup> In Kashmir too mice were taken by common people.<sup>137</sup>

As compared to ancient times we find that during the eleventh century A.D., the digest-makers like Lakṣmīdhara did not like that big bulls should be sacrificed for a distinguished guest. Referring to Vasiṣṭha's rule that a big bull (*mahokṣa*) was to be killed in order to entertain an honourable guest, Lakṣmīdhara explains that such a custom was prevalent in olden days.<sup>138</sup>

Tradition records that beef was taken by the artisans of Madhyadeśa<sup>139</sup> or Mid-India. This might have been the custom in some previous age, but not in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D.

### *Wine :*

The knowledge of preparation of drinks like *paiṣṭi* from cereals, *gauḍi* from *guḍa* or dried-up juice of sugarcane, *mādhvi* from *madhu* or honey, *medaka* from rice, *āsava* from

treacle, *madhu* from grapes etc. was passed on from olden days to the people of the twelfth century A.D.<sup>140</sup> Amongst these intoxicant drinks possibly the most popular were those prepared from molasses and rice.

With regard to the attitude of the law-givers to the drinking of wine, it must be said that at no period of Indian history it was favoured. During our period Bhaṭṭa Bhava-deva of Bengal disapproved of its use by all classes of people.<sup>141</sup> Probably knowing this attitude, the Muslim travellers like Sulaiman have praised the abstention of Indians from wine.<sup>142</sup> But in Chapter XV we shall show that wine was rather extensively used by some classes of men and women.

An account of the articles of food in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. reveal some startling changes which have taken place in course of time. The most important of these is the almost total abstention from meat and fish by the Brāhmaṇas of Upper India. We notice that contemporary literature of Bengal does not mention either the cultivation or taking of pulses. It will not be safe to draw any conclusion from this negative evidence. *Masūra* and *māṣa* pulses were not favoured by the Brāhmaṇas of the Uttar Pradesh in normal times. While the drinks prepared from the juice of sugarcane was disallowed in the Uttar Pradesh, it was in use in Bengal in the period under survey.

The poorer section of the community had to remain contented with barley, rice and vegetables. In Kashmir, barley was looked upon as a cereal for poorer people. Kalhaṇa tells us that in his worst days, Harṣa was given barley.<sup>143</sup> Elsewhere the above-mentioned chronicler informs us that when the priests of the shrine of Bhūteśvara (Śiva) wished to demonstrate their poverty before the King Avantivarman, they offered to the deity only "a wild-growing vegetable of bitter taste called *utpalaśāka*".<sup>144</sup> That rice, vegetable plants or *śāka* and *āmalaka* and *priyāla* fruits formed the simplest diet in Mid-India is also evident from the food taken by the Śaiva ascetic Prabodhaśiva in the tenth century A.D.<sup>145</sup> The

*Yaśastilakachampū* tells us of the following course of food taken by the miser Kiliñjaka: stale boiled rice which was full of husk and gravel, rotten beans, drops of rancid *atasī* oil, overburnt brinjals, gruel mixed with plenty of mustard, and a beverage having some alkaline fluid with a taste like that of salted water.<sup>146</sup> This poor fare may be contrasted with the menu for the richer people which consisted of rice, white and clear like the glances of beautiful women, curries charming as the graceful movements of dancing girls, curds well-shaped and hard like the breasts of a savoury woman; milk sweet as the glances of one's beloved; sugared preparations of milk-rice, and water perfumed with camphor, delicious sweets as well as rice boiled along with milk and sugar.<sup>147</sup>

#### *Alms-houses :*

The wide-spread poverty of the people probably inspired richer classes to endow a large number of alms-houses. Most of these alms-houses were attached to temples<sup>148</sup> and were meant to cater to the needs of pilgrims and wandering bands of scholars. These *sattras* or *anna-sattras* were started not only by kings like Yaksapāla at Gaya,<sup>149</sup> Vallabhadeva of Assam in Hapyacha-maṇḍala,<sup>150</sup> Chāhamāna Prithvīrāja I<sup>151</sup> Chaulukya Jayasīṃha<sup>152</sup> near Sahasraliṅga tank at Patan, Vatsarāja<sup>153</sup> of Lāṭa, Govindarāja<sup>154</sup> of Valabhī in Saurāṣṭra and Jayasīṃha of Kashmir,<sup>155</sup> feudatories like Ṭhakkura Lūna-pāsaka at Salakhanapura<sup>156</sup> in Gujarat, Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Vijalladeva, a feudatory under the Chaulukya kings Ajaya-pāla and Bhīma II, in Khandohaka,<sup>157</sup> Māṇḍalika Brahmadeva under the Kalachuri King Prithvīdeva II of Ratanpur, at Kumarakota,<sup>158</sup> minister Gaṅgādhara who served King Ratnadeva II at Nārāyaṇapura,<sup>159</sup> which is thirty miles north-east of Kharod Bilaspur, a Kāyastha named Kanaka<sup>160</sup> in Kashmir in the reign of Sussala and the Brāhmaṇa Prahāsa at Siyamba<sup>161</sup> in Bengal. Most of these alms-houses were endowed with villages<sup>162</sup> and free meals were given to the poor people, the blind, the old, the infirm and travellers.<sup>163</sup> Some

times the donors like the Chaulukya kings Siddharāja and Bhima II, Mahāmāṇḍalika Vaijalladeva and Govindarāja of Saurāṣṭra specifically stated that they were meant for the feeding of the Brāhmaṇas only. Vaijalladeva sometime before 1173 A.D. laid down the condition that fifty Brāhmaṇas would be fed, but they must not have been fed previously<sup>164</sup> and so possibly alms were received by only those Brāhmaṇas who had just arrived to settle themselves in the villages. The inscription of Govindarāja categorically states that the alms-houses were not only meant for beggars, travellers and Brāhmaṇas but also for scholars and students who could stay in the hall of charity,<sup>165</sup> which was endowed with four plots of land.

#### *Inns :*

A perusal of the writings of Abu Zeid of Siraj reveals that inns were built on the highways for the accommodation of travellers. In order that these travellers might buy necessary articles themselves, shops were opened close to the inns. That foreign writer also notes that in order that the travellers might satisfy their sexual urge, the persons who set up inns also settled public-women in them.<sup>166</sup>

While the foundation of alms-houses was an act of charity, the *dharmasāstras* laid down that hospitality was a duty. *Yājñavalkya* I. 121 and *Parāśara* I. 38 directed that it was the duty of the householder to maintain dependants, show hospitality, observe *śrāddha* and worship the five daily sacrifices. These authorities have also been quoted with approval by Lakṣmīdhara and Chāṇḍeśvara.<sup>167</sup>

North Indians of the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. were more large-hearted than people of previous ages. *Śātā-tapa*<sup>168</sup> denied hospitality and even 'verbal courtesy' to those heretics who followed non-Vedic religion, who neglected duties of the stages of life or *āśrama*, who paraded the glories of their own religion without practising it, vicious men, who paraded their dialectical powers by arguing against

the *Vedas*, and who practised false humility like cranes. But Lakṣmīdhara while commenting upon these verses of Śātātapa, says that the above-mentioned classes of persons may be denied all the rites of hospitality, but not food (*annadāna-mātram tu na nisiddhayate*).<sup>169</sup>

### *Poverty :*

In a feudal society peasants and artisans are usually condemned to lead a life of poverty. Material wealth is normally monopolised by the aristocracy, which consists of three-tiers-landed, official and mercantile. There are some indications to show that the masses of North India during the period under survey were not in very affluent circumstances. Their needs were very few, they did not aspire for luxuries; they earned enough only for two square meals a day, one or two pieces of cloth to hide their nakedness and some kind of shelter over their head. Contemporary literature shows that even these were not available to many. A poem of Dhenḍhanapāda<sup>170</sup> purports to say that his house stood on a solitary hillock, in which there was no rice in the earthen pot and every one was hungry. Like the family of frogs the number of his children increased ever and anon. A poem of Vāra describes how a poor housewife with her emaciated body and torn clothes feels perplexed at the clamour of her children for food and she prays that one *māna* measure of rice may be sufficient for them for one hundred days.<sup>171</sup> The lack of house room and additions to the family are referred to in another poem thus: "Within the house is the kitchen, there the mortar, there too the crockery, there the children, there his own study. He has put up with all that, but what can we say of the condition of the wretched householder when his wife, who today or tomorrow will present him with a new addition to his family, must spend there her time of labour".<sup>172</sup> Still another poem quoted by Śrīdharadāsa (in 1206 A.D.) depicts the pitiable dearth of clothes. It runs

\* 1 *Māna* is equivalent to 320 *tolās* or 131 ounces.

as follows: "Even when I saw my children suffering from hunger, their body emaciated like dead body, or when I saw the old and worn out water-jar leaking, I did not feel so much sorrow as when I saw my wife smiling pitiably and making a request to a female neighbour for the loan of a needle to mend her torn cloth and the latter turned angry"<sup>173</sup> Poets must have used hyperboles in describing the poverty of the people in these poems, but there was certainly a substratum of truth behind the poetic exaggeration.

### *Fatalism and Astrology :*

It is no wonder that the poor living under such wretched conditions and the rich perpetually haunted by the fear of bureaucratic oppression or invasion, sack of cities and looting of property would turn pathetically to astrology.

Lakṣmīdhara quotes several passages<sup>174</sup> from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Vyāsa*, *Matsya Purāṇa* and *Manusmṛiti* to prove that fatalism is the creed of cowards and sluggards. The author of the *Śukranītisāra* also praises men who depend on their own endeavours rather than rely on fate.<sup>175</sup> Such a belief in human effort was preached earlier by Medhātithi in the ninth century A.D. In explaining *Manu* VII. 205 he writes: "Thus destiny being 'incomprehensible' it is not necessary to devote much attention to it. It is human activity which we can think over and then do what has to be done."

But these exhortations fell mostly on deaf ears in the troubled years of the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. Even Lakṣmīdhara and the author of the *Śukranītisāra* had to admit the influence of fate (*daiva*). Both of them believed that success or failure in one's life was the result of one's actions in the previous births.<sup>176</sup> Once this is recognised, fatalism cannot but steal in. Even a learned historian like Kalhaṇa ascribes many events in Kashmir to fate or destiny.<sup>177</sup>

All sections of the community believed in good and bad omens and in lucky and unlucky stars. Kshemendra in the

ninth canto of his *Kalāvīlāsa* draws attention of the scholarly world to the various forms of roguery practised by the astrologers. But the response from the literary public must have been poor. The *Samudratilaka*, a book on omens, was begun by Durlabharāja in 1160 A.D. and finished by his son Jagaddeva. Jagaddeva also composed a work on dreams entitled the *Svapnachintāmaṇi*. Probably the nadir of intelligence and commonsense was reached when the twelfth century writer Narapati claimed in his book, *Narapatiya-yacharyā Svarodaya* that with the help of diagrams the results of wars and adventures could be forecast.<sup>178</sup>

Astrologers enjoyed an enviable position in courts. Dr. D. C. Sircar has referred to the recommendation of *smṛitis* and *nītiśāstras* on appointment of astrologers by kings.<sup>179</sup> As in Arab and western countries,<sup>180</sup> so the Gāhāḍavālas<sup>181</sup> maintained astrologers in their courts. King Govindachandra on the occasion of his ceremonial bath on the *akṣaya-tṛīṭiyā* day at Monghyr, granted a village to a Brāhmaṇa astrologer named Śrīdhara<sup>182</sup> in V.S. 1202/1146 A.D. Other astrologers were also donees of lands granted by kings of Somavaṃśī, Bhaṇja<sup>183</sup> and Kalachuri<sup>184</sup> dynasties. Sometimes these astrologers acted as witnesses to Chāhamāṇa grants<sup>185</sup> and helped the Chaulukya King<sup>186</sup> in expeditions.

Belief in astrology exerted a baneful influence on all cases of people. Kings and generals did not go out on an expedition when it was politically expedient to do so, but only at the time declared as auspicious by the astrologer. Their repeated defeats did not teach them that astrological forecasts were incorrect and as such untrustworthy for future guidance. The masses reconciled themselves to the condition under which they were living on the ground that their sufferings were ordained by the stars or were the results of the actions of their previous births. This fatalistic belief made many of them complacent and deprived them of initiative and energetic perseverance.

## REFERENCES TO CHAPTER XII

## (Daily life of the People)

- 1 DHNI, VOL. II, p. 950.
- 2 JAHS. VIII, p. 40ff.
- 3 EI II, p. 11. verse 14.
- 4 RT. VII. 1325, VIII. 734. 1127, 1169-1185.
- 5 *Ibid.*, VIII. 1184, 1210-1211.
- 6 *Ibid.*, VIII. 1212.
- 7 SS. Ch. XVIII. 1-6.
- 8 *Agni Purāṇa*, Ch. 239. 24-28 and *Sukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.) I. 213-214.
- 9 Centres of administration—Anhilwara (BG. I. p. 511-512), Vanthali (IA. XVIII. 110), Lattalur (IA. XIX. 164), Tekkali (EI. XXI. 132), Mt. Abu, Varanasi-Katak as capital of the Somavamsī kings, Khajuraho, Chadobha (DHNI. II. 832) Dhavalapuri and Partabgarh as seats of Chāhamāna kings (DHNI. II. 1058-59) Naddūla or Nādol (DHNI. II. 1104ff), Javalipur or Jalor (DHNI. II. 1124ff), Vagada or Dungarpur (DHNI. II. 1206ff).
- Trade and commerce—Broach, Cambay, Cheul, Somanatha Supara (BG. I. p. 513ff), Sripatha or modern Biana (EI. III. 48), Ambadapura in Berar (EI. XXI. 127), Chadobha or modern Dubkund (DHNI II. 832), Asawal or Ahmedabad (HIED. I. 87-88), Tribeni in Bengal.
- Military bases—Kachh (BG. I. p. 517ff), Kalanjar (DHNI. II. 665), Gopagiri or Gopādri or modern Gwalior (DHNI, II. 678, 823), Kol in Gujarat (HIED II. 222), Charaṇādri or Chunar, Monghyr and Patna during Pāla regime.
- 10 EI. XXI. 98, verse 2; HB. I. p. 199.
- 11 RT. VIII. 2431 and 2440.
- 12 *Ancient Geography*; pp. 162. 408.
- 13 *Prthvirājaviṣaya*, canto V.
- 14 BG. I, p. 513.
- 15 EI. XXI. 96.
- 16 DHNI II, p. 795 (Rewah grant).
- 17 Introduction p. V. of *Pārthaparākramavyāyoga* (GOS).
- 18 De, N. L. *Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India*, p. 113.
- 19 Stein in RT. II. p. 483 (Appendices).
- 20 Manu VII. 121.
- 21 *Sukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.) I. 374.
- 22 AR. pp. 181-182.
- 23 EI. VIII. 82 (Nasik inscription), EI. XV. 150 (Damodarpur pl).
- 24 EI. I. 169-170 (Siyadoni inscr.); EI. XI. 56 (Bhinmal inscr), *Ibid* XI. 58 (Sanchor inscr). Cf. earlier references to Pañchakula in Hund (EI. XXII 97), and Chapa (IA. XII. 113-114) inscriptions.



25 On nature and functions of *Pañchakula* vide Majumdar A. K. *History of the Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, pp. 236-242. His conclusions are that these were associated with and appointed by the provincial government, sometimes were placed in charge of cities and were appointed to supervise construction of a temple or seize property of the deceased.

26 EI. I. 154ff, lines 2-5.

27 EI. XI. pp. 37-41 Dhalopa is four miles to the south-west of Nādol (DHNI. II. 1112).

28 EI. I. pp. 333-334 verse 13.

29 JUPHS XIX. (1946), pp. 79-80.

30 Veraval inscr. of Arjunavarman (IA. XI. 241), Anavada inscr. (PO. III. 25 and IA. 1912, pp. 20-21), inscr. of Bhīma II (IA. XVIII. 110); Porbandar inscr. of Visaladeva (Po. II. 225).

31 RT. VIII. 1210.

32 *Rāj.* pp. 42-51ff; SS. ch. X. 14-15. RC. III. 9, 30, 41-42; *Sukranītisūra* (ed. Sarkar) I. 431-433; *Prithvīrājaviṣṭaya*, canto V: EI. II. 238, XXIII. 250, and XXVIII. 140.

33 HIED. II. pp. 34, 40, 44 and 46.

34 EI. I. 295 (Vaḍnagar-Praśasti-Verses 23-26).

35 *Rāj.* 42. (*dvijavaiḍya-vanik-śilpī-kūrakṣakastathā*).

36 *Sukranītisūra* (ed. Cal.) II. 198-205; (ed. Sarkar, II, 397-411); SS. ch. X. 89-102.

37 Introduction p. 54 to HIED II (ed. Aligarh); Husain, Y: *Mediaeval Indian Culture* pp. 133ff.

38 SS. (Vol. I. p. 84) ch. XVII. verses 185, 191; *Rāj.* pp. 180-188.

39 *Kathāsaritūgāra* (Tr. Tawney) Vol. I, p. 79.

40 *Samayamārikā* (NS. Press) canto IV, verses 72-73.

41 *Prithvīrāja-rāso*, canto 61, verses 424-445 quoted in Trivedi: *Chānd Baradūyī aur unkā kāvya* p. 93.

42 EI. I. 295 (Vaḍnagar Praśasti, verses 21-22).

43 RC. III. verses 29-30 and 32 (ed. Majumdar, Basak and Banerji).

44 *Vikramāṅkadevacharita*, canto XVIII.

45 *Prithvīrājaviṣṭaya* canto V. (JRAS. 1913, p. 273).

46 *Prithvīrājaviṣṭaya* (JRAS. 1913, p. 273); RC. III. 33-36.

47 *Prahaṇḍhachintāmaṇi* (Tr. Tawney) p. 29; ch. X. 14-16.

48 *Rāj.* p. 42; SS. ch. XIX. 58; *Sukranītisūra* (ed. Cal.) I. 212.

49 EI. XXVIII. p. 244.

50 *Sadukti*, II. 84. 2 (ed. Punjab Oriental Series No. XV. p. 123).

51 *Ibid.*, II. 84. 4 (ed. Punjab Oriental Series No. XV. p. 124).

52 *Ibid.*, V. 38. 2 (p. 303).

53 *Sadukti* V. 1. 5 (p. 278).

54 *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 309-312.

55 SS. ch. 15 verse 23 (Vol. I. p. 63).

56 Renou: *The Civilisation of Ancient India*, p. 161.

- 57 EI. XI. 54-55 (Jalor inscr) ; IA. XLI. (1912), pp. 20-21 (Anavada inscr).
- 58 EI. XI. 54f.
- 59 IA. XLI. 20f.
- 60 RT. VII. 1606.
- 61 Trevelyan: *English Social History*, pp. 202, 259-260.
- 62 RT. VII. 858.
- 63 Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* 26. 5. 11-12. 166-167: *Priyadarśikā canto* III. 7; *Kuṭṭānimatam* (ed. T. N. Ray) verse 802.
- 64 Cf. *Kuṭṭānimatam* (ed. T. N. Ray) Verse 931
- 65 *Raj.* pp. 180-181.
- 66 *Trisaṣṭīśalākōpuruṣacharita*, Vol. III, p. 239. See also Majumdar, A. K.: *Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, p. 354 for history of men with buttock-bells (*āpana-ghaṇṭā*).
- 67 RT. VII. 606. 928-931. 944. RC. III. 35-37, IB. III. 35 and 41; Plates of Viśvarūpasena and Keśavasena.
- 68 *Saṅgītaratnākara*, Introductory chapter I, verse 18.
- 69 *Mānasollāsa* (GOS. Vol. 84. p. 187) *Viṃśati* IV. 2. 74.
- 70 RT. VII. 606.
- 71 *Vaij.* 114-141. 145-147; *Abhidhānachintāmaṇi* 117. 6f; RT. VIII. 901-02, 1538 for drums, gongs and cymbals; *Raj.* pp. 16, 183; EI. II. 185 (Nagpur inscr. dated 1104-05 A. D. verse 30 for *paṭaha jharjhara* and kettledrum).
- 72 RT. VIII. 169-174; *Mānasollāsa* (GOS. Vol. 84, p. 225) *Viṃśati* IV. 5. 828-878 mentions as many as eight varieties.
- 73 *Mānasollāsa* (GOS Vol. 84, p. 229) *Viṃśati* IV. 5. 879-996; *Kathāsaritsāgara* (ed. Penzer, Vol. II) Bk. V. Ch. 25, p. 200.
- 74 PIHC. 1939 (Calcutta Session) p. 256. Arch. Survey Memoir, N. 55, pl. XXVI. No. 31.
- 75 *Mānasollāsa* (GOS Vol. 84, pp. 211-225) *viṃśati* IV. 4. 661-827.
- 76 Introduction, p. 35 of *Mānasollāsa* (GOS. Vol. 84).
- 77 DV. III. verse 10. VII. 10 and 44; *Trisaṣṭīśalākōpuruṣacharita*, Vol. III, p. 68. A detailed account is given in Majumdar, A. K.: *Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, pp. 359-360.
- 78 Commentary on DV. VII. 44.
- 79 *Abhidhānachintāmaṇi* 277. 352-353; *Vaij* 171. 161-162. Cf. earlier references to the play with ball (*kanduka*) in *Daśakumāra-charita*, Ucchvāsa 6 where the participants are ladies; *Svapnavāsavadattam*, ch. II.
- 80 *Kuṭṭānimatam*, verse 886; *Vikramorvaṣī*, IV. 292-293.
- 81 *Pavanadūtam* (ed. Chakravarti) verses 33 and 38; *Kumārapūla-charita*, IV. 41-58; Cf. *Handiqui*; *Yasastilakachampū* and *Indian Culture*, p. 169 for watersports of youngmen in Śipra.
- 82 *Kumārapūla-charita*, Canto III., verses 19-26.
- 83 RV. I. 41. 91. X. 34. 8 and 12; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, V. 4.

- 46, *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, VIII. 16, Mbh. IV. 1. 24; Jātaka I. 151, 221, III, 61, 131, VI. 133, 137, 171 etc; *Kōmasūtra*, I. 3. 16; *Van-gīya Mahākośa* v. akṣa, HB. I. 615; *Sūtrakṛitāṅga* I. 9. 17; *Kuṭṭanī-matam*, verse II, *Kāthāsarisūgara* (ed. Tawney) Vol. II, p. 225; RT. VIII. 1740, 2969; Sachau I. p. 183, JRAS. 1898, p. 129.
- 84 *Moharājaparājaya* Act. IV. pp. 86-87.
- 85 *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 489-490.
- 86 *Manu* IX. 220.
- 87 *Niyata* p. 422.
- 88 *Moharājaparājaya*, p. 83.
- 89 *Deśināmamālā* I. 53, III. 30; *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tr. Tawney), p. 139 (td. Singhi Jain Series, p. 89); *muṣṭidyūtam* referred to in *Deśināmamālā* I. 7 (*ambettī*).
- 90 *Abhidhānachintāmaṇi* 404-480; Vaij, 137. 11-14; Cf. *Kumā-rasambhavam* I. 19 and *Kuṭṭanīmatam*, verse 728.
- 91 *Trīṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacharita*, Vol. I. p. 150.
- 92 *Trīṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacharita*, Vol. I, p. 158; Vol. III. 262; *Deśināmamālā*, IV. 21.
- 93 *Mānasollāsa* Viñśati IV. 10. verses 997-1276; Bṛhaspati XXVI. 1. (SBE. Vol. XXXIII); *Trīṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacharita*, Vol. III. p. 279.
- 94 *Mānasollāsa* IV. 11. verses 1277-1297; *Mahāvīracharita*, Verse 74.
- 95 *Mānasollāsa*, IV. 13. verses 1330-1725 referring to twenty-one kinds of hunting; *Aṣṭādhyāyī* V. 4. 126, IV. 4. 35. IV 3. 5; *Hamīramahākāvya*, IV. 38f.
- 96 *Aṣṭādhyāyī* III. 3. 99.; IV. 4. 43, *Kūmasūtra* I. 4. 31; *Mbh.* Ādi. I. 82.
- 97 *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. II. 2. 19.
- 98 *Ancient Accounts of India and China*, p. 34.
- 99 *Struggle for Empire*, p. 485.
- 100 *Niyata* p. 395; *Kṛityaratnākara*, p. 257.
- 101 *Niyata*, p. 397; *Kṛityaratnākara*, p. 285.
- 102 EI. XI. 57.
- 103 *Deśināmamālā*, VIII. 8.
- 104 RC. IV. 36 (ed. Majumdar, Basak, Banerji, p. 143).
- 105 Majumdar, A. K.: *Op. cit.*, p. 354.
- 106A. *Prākṛita Paiṅgala*, p. 403, lines 1-3 (ed. B. I.)
- 106 *Naiṣadhacharita*, Canto XIV. 68.
- 107 *Deśināmamālā*, I. 88 for *Sesamum* (unhia), II. 14 (*kamkka-sāro*).
- 107 *Deśināmamālā*, VI. 44.
- 109 *Naiṣadhacharita*, Canto XVI. 70; *Niyata*, pp. 435, 444 etc.; KV. p. 410.
- 110 JOHRS. Vol. I, p. 301 (Lingaraja Temple inscr).
- 111 *Prāyaścitta-prakaraṇa* (VRS. ed.), p. 67.

112 EI. I 271. ff (Cintra Praśasti verses 52 and 57 mention *mudga*; *Kuṭṭanīmatam* verse 228 mentions *kulattha*, *chana* and *masūra* : *Niyata*, p. 427 mentions *masūra* ; *Narmamālā* I, 124 mentions *mudga* ; *Mānasollāsa Viṃśati* III. 13. 1358-59 mention *chanaka*, *māṣa*, *masūra* and *mudga*.

113 *Niyata*, pp. 275-284 ; *Grihastharatnākara*, pp. 352-367.

114 *Niyata*, pp. 279-283.

115 *Ibid.* p. 292.

116 RT. VII. 1621 and VII. 2586.

117 EI. X. 50 ; IA. IV. 268.

118 RT. VIII. 143 ; *Samayamātrikā*, canto II. 26.

119 RC. III. 19.

120 HB. I. pp. 611-612.

121 *Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā*, 1326 BS. pp. 86 f.n., 103.

122 *Niyata*, pp. 310-311 ; Gāḥaḍavāla inscr. in EI. VIII. 154 ; XI. 24 ; and XXVI. 73.

123 *Laṭakumelaka*, Canto I. pp. 9-12 (KM)

124 *Mānasollāsa Viṃśati*, III. 13, 1525-1536 : *Nilamata Purāṇa* (ed. De Vreese) verses 508-514 ; RT. V. 119. VII. 522 and VIII. 139 *Samayamātrikā*, II. 25, 71-74.

125 RT. VII. 522.

126 *Niyata*, pp. 311-17 ; *Grihastharatnākara*, pp. 380-384 ; SP. verses 633.

127 *Niyata*, p. 412.

128 HB. I. p. 612 referring to *Prāyascittaprakaraṇa* : *Vāṅgālir Itihāsa*, pp. 539-540.

129 RT. V. 119, VII. 1149.

130 *Mānasollāsa Viṃśati* III. 13. 1420-1547 (Deer in verse 1516, tortoise, verse 1537, crabs verse 1540, mice living in fields near rivers, verse 1543, birds verse 1522, boar verse 1523, fish/ verses 1525-1536, boar verse 1523).

131 IHQ. VIII. 311.

132 *Niyata*, pp. 398. 441. 446 etc.

133 *Deśināmamālā*, VII. 44. and VIII. 39 referring to *Vaualiam* and *Susanthia*.

134 *Naiṣadhacharita* XVI. 81-82. Cf. inscriptional references in IA. VI. 53, XII. 201 (Banavasa grant), EI. XVIII. 320ff (Betma pl).

135 *Sachau*, II. 151 ; *Niyata*, pp. 304-308.

136 *Niyata*, p. 303.

137 RT. VIII. 139.

138 *Niyata*, p. 328 commenting on *Vaśiṣṭha* 4. 8.

139 *Sukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.) IV. 5. 49.

140 *Deśināmamālā*, III. 41, 45 ; VIII. 4, I. 46, II. 2, IV. 4. V. 34, VI. 35, 41, 50, 75, and VIII. 4 ; *Niyata*, pp. 331-333 ; *Grihastharatnākara*, pp. 393-395 ; *Prāyascittaprakaraṇa* p. 40 ; Ray, J. C. : *Ancient Indian Life*, pp. 75-83.

- 141 *Prāyaścittaprakaraṇa*, p. 40ff.
  - 142 *Ancient Accounts of India and China*, p. 33.
  - 143 RT. VII. 1621.
  - 144 RT. V. 49.
  - 145 MASJ. 1932 on *Haihayas of Tripurī and their Monuments* p. 119, verse 11.
  - 146 *Yaśastilakachampū* (ed. N. S. Press) Book III, p. 404.
  - 147 *Ibid.*, Book III. pp. 401-402.
  - 148 IA. VI. 201. 203; EI. XXI. 99 and XXVI. 263.
  - 149 IA. XVI. 65.
  - 150 EI. V. 181-188 (Assam pl. dated 1185 A.D. verses 13-14).
  - 151 DHNI. II. 1070.
  - 152 IA. IV. 267.
  - 153 EI. II. 202.
  - 154 EI. II. 226 (Vaghli inscr. verse 31 lines 4-5).
  - 155 RT. VIII. 3320.
  - 156 IA. VI. 201-03.
  - 157 IA. XVIII. 83, lines 18-21.
  - 158 EI. XXVI. 263 (Ratanpur inscr. dated KS. 915/1163-64 A.D. verse 38).
  - 159 *Ibid.* XXI. 164 (Kharod inscr. dated KS 933/1181 A.D).
  - 160 RT. VIII. 570-571.
  - 161 EI. XIII. 292, verse 26.
  - 162 The alms-houses started by Lūnapāsaka and Vaijalladeva in the kingdom of the Chaulukyas, Māṇḍalika Brahmadeva under Tūṣṇāna Kalachuris, Kings Vallabhaḍeva and Govindarāja of Valabhī.
  - 163 EI. II. 226.
  - 164 IA. XVIII. 83, lines 18-19.
  - 165 EI. II. 227.
  - 166 *Ancient Accounts of India and China* (ed. Renaudot), p. 87.
  - 167 *Niyata*, p. 218; *Grihastharatnākara*, p. 309.
  - 168 *Niyata*, p. 193 and *Grihastharatnākara*, p. 295. The verses attributed to Sītātapa by Lakṣmīdhara are not found in printed text.
  - 169 *Niyata*, pp. 193-194.
  - 170 *Bauddha Gāna O'Dohā and Charyāgiti Padāvalī*, Pada No. 33.
  - 171 *Sadukti* (p. 310) V. 49. 4.
  - 172 Keith: *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 235.
  - 173 *Sadukti* (p. 309) V. 48-3.
  - 174 Rājadharmakāṇḍa in *Kṛtyakalpataru*, p. 140.
  - 175 *Śukranūṭisūtra* (ed. Cal). I. 46 and 49 (ed. Sarkar I. 95-96, and 105).
  - 176 Rāj. p. 141.; *Śukranūṭisūtra* (ed. Cal) I. 47 and 49 (ed. Sarkar, I. 97-104).
  - 177 RT. VII. 37, 67, 803, 1140-1141 and VIII. 220, 1276-1278, 1401, 2279-2280.
- Speaking of omens, Marco Polo (c. 1293 A.D. observed re:

Lar. (Gujarat) "To every day of the week they assign an augury of this sort. Suppose that there is some purchase in hand, he who proposes to buy, when he gets up in the morning takes note of his own shadow in the sun, which he says ought to be on that day of such and such a length for the day he completes his purchase; if not, he will on no account do so, but waits till his shadow corresponds with that prescribed.... Moreover, if in going out, he hears any one sneeze, if it seems to him a good omen he will go on, but if the reverse he will sit down on the spot where he is, so long as he thinks that he ought to tarry before going on again."

(Quoted in Sastri: *Foreign Notices*, pp. 176-177).

178 *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 330 and 786.

179 IHQ. XXVIII. pp. 346-347.

180 Nizāmī wrote in 1155 A.D. that it was necessary for the court of Arab kings to maintain an astrologer because enterprises of kings "will not succeed unless undertaken at seasons adjudged propitious by sagacious astrologers" (Haskins: *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, p. 54; Hitti: *History of the Arabs*, p. 318).

181 EI. II. 362, XI. 24 XIV. 194, XXIV. 294, XXVI. 73, 271 etc.

182 EI. VII 100 (Lar pl. dated 1146 A.D., line 25).

183 EI. XVIII. 299, XIX. 44 and IHQ. XX. (1944) p. 247.

184 EI. XIX. 212 and XXII. 159ff and 156.

185 IA. XIX. 218.; EI. XI. 37.

186 EI. II. 438 and 440.



## CHAPTER XIII

### Festivals.

A perusal of the description of festivals in contemporary digests shows that North India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was pervaded with festivals. The *nibandhakāras* of this period prescribed dancing, singing in accompaniment of musical instruments sumptuous feeling of the Brāhmaṇas, friends and relatives and going out in procession, as obligatory performances in many of these festivals. This is in striking contrast to the tendency of later digest-makers to enjoin fasting on all occasions.

Lakṣmīdhara, the Prime Minister of King Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla, has left for us a graphic account of a number of such festivals in his monumental work, the *Kṛityakalpataru*. The cycle of festivals began with the advent of the month of Chaitra, which was regarded then as the beginning of the year. According to him, the world was created on the first day of the bright half of Chaitra and so a festival was there to commemorate it. On this occasion, Brahmā the creator, Maheśa and other gods, demigods, serpents, Yakṣas, the seven seas, the *varṣas* and also the land of Bhārata-varṣa were worshipped. The *pūjā* was marked by *homa*, sacrifices, gifts and the wearing of new clothes and ornaments.<sup>1</sup> Invitations were extended to the Brāhmaṇas, friends and relatives. The worship of Bhāratavarṣa furnishes us with another instance of the fundamental unity of India. On the 6th day of the bright fortnight of Chaitra, Skanda was worshipped<sup>2</sup> because he was made the commander of the forces of Devas on that day. Skanda was worshipped with lamps, ornaments, clothes and a live cock. Lakṣmidhara and Chaṇdeśvara clearly state that the live cock was to be given to the god for play and not for sacrifice. The performance of

this rite was meant for securing the immunity of children from diseases. The 6th and 7th days of the bright fortnight of Chaitra were holy to the Sun. Alberuni observes that the 6th day is a day of fasting and the correctness of his observation can be corroborated from the *Kṛityaratnākara*.<sup>3</sup> On the 7th day the Brāhmaṇas were given curds and *pāyasa*. The eating of rice was forbidden on this day which was also known as *Anodanasaptamī*. It is interesting to observe here that in the printed edition of Hemādri's *Chaturvargachintāmaṇi*, the date for the *Anodanasaptamī* is given as 7th Vaiśākha Śukla.<sup>4</sup> Such a festival in Vaiśākha has not been mentioned either by Jimūtavāhana or by Lakṣmīdhara. On the 8th day in eastern India, people used to take eight buds of the Aśoka flower as it was believed to have the virtue of freeing one from sorrows.<sup>5</sup> The *Aśokāṣṭamī* festival has not been referred to by Lakṣmīdhara although it has been mentioned by Hemādri.<sup>6</sup> Another festival which took place on the 11th Chaitra Śukla was observed in honour of Rukmīṇī.<sup>7</sup> Alberuni<sup>8</sup> and his pupil Gardī<sup>9</sup> speak of a different festival on the 11th Chaitra though neither of them mentions whether it was observed on the dark or bright fortnight. However, on the occasion of the festival called *Hindoli-Chaitra*, Vāsudeva was swung in temples. The more interesting part of the festival was that the devotees of Vāsudeva also used to swing in their houses. Gardīzī further informs us that on this day, women used to decorate themselves and asked for gifts from their husbands. The twelfth and thirteenth days of the bright fortnight of the month were marked by merriment on the occasion of the worship of kāma or God of Love. The celebration began on the twelfth day with fasts in honour of Viṣṇu. In the afternoon Kāmadeva was worshipped with big leaves of trees. As the *Madana-dvādaśī* fell on the same day, the devotees placed a jar and covered it with rice, fruits, sugarcane plants, white clothes and gold according to one's means.<sup>10</sup> At night Kāmadeva was worshipped with cold water. Lakṣmīdhara and Chanḍeś-



vara prescribe that wife of the devotee should bathe herself with this water before sun-rise on the 13th day.<sup>11</sup> The worship also continued on the 14th day and the festival was known as Madana or Kāma-mahotsava.<sup>12</sup> This was a famous festival and it was observed with dancing, songs, and merry-making all over India from the time of Vātsyāyana at least.

Prof. Jogesh Chandra Ray<sup>13</sup> has shown different dates for observance of the Dol festival in different periods commemorating the celebration of the New Year, in Bhādra, Srāvaṇa and also Mārgaśīrṣa. In ancient times the Dol was celebrated in honour of the Sun, then in honour of Viṣṇu and finally, it has been ascribed to Kṛṣṇa. Prof. Ray concluded that "*Dol Yātrā* was confounded with spring festival and red coloured powder and water added to complete the picture."

There are considerable differences between mediaeval and modern India on the date and manner of the observance of the *Holi* festival. In modern India *Holi* is observed on the full moon day of Phālguna,<sup>14</sup> and is marked by various forms of amusements. But during the period under review neither the form of celebration nor the date was the same. Something like, but certainly not identical with the *Holi*, a festival called *Kāmamahotsava* was observed between the twelfth day of the bright half and the full moon day in the month of Chaitra. Lakṣmīdhara, Jīmūtavāhana and Chaṇḍeśvara inform us that the twelfth and thirteenth days of Chaitra Śukla were sacred to Hari.<sup>15</sup> In these digests we do not find any mention of bon-fire or spraying of colour, each of which is quite an event in modern *Holi*. Of course, the Bengal school began associating Holākā with the spring festival from the time of Jīmūtavāhana. But he does not state categorically the date and whether it was observed by people of Northern and Western India.<sup>16</sup> Without giving any details, Hemachandra refers to *Phaggu* in his *Deśināmamālā*<sup>17</sup> and Alberuni<sup>18</sup> to *Bahand*. Thus it is evident that till the time of Chaṇḍeśvara there was no association of *Holi* with the spraying of coloured water and dust which we find in modern days.

It may be suggested here that the modern form of *Holi* was taking shape sometime before the sixteenth century. Gopāla-bhaṭṭa tells us that in continuation of the swing festival of Kṛṣṇa amidst songs and dances, fragrances should be thrown at Kṛṣṇa first and then at the Vaiṣṇavas on the twelfth day of the bright half of Chaitra.<sup>19</sup> It is interesting to observe that the above-mentioned writer speaks of a *Vasantotsava*<sup>20</sup> on the full moon day of Phālguna, a date which is identical with that of modern *Holi*.

Alberuni states that on the full moon day of the month of Chaitra a festival is held called the *Bahand* (*Vasanta*?). This festival used to be celebrated by women when they "put on ornaments and demand presents from their husbands".<sup>21</sup> Lakṣmidhara on the basis of the *Brahma Purāṇa*, states that an image of demon may be made either of earth or grass. On that occasion, one should decorate oneself with clothes and beautiful ornaments, eat meat and barley, drink and use varied weapons, and umbrellas and have clean *shaves*.<sup>22</sup> Further, it appears from a perusal of the digests of Northern India that the festival was associated with Viṣṇu, because the day began with worship of Viṣṇu.<sup>23</sup> But in the Gujarat area, it was a Śaiva festival. Abhayatilaka Gaṇi in his commentary on *Dvyāśraya*<sup>24</sup> states that the *Dolā* or *Dola* festival (14th day of bright half of Chaitra) was observed by all the four classes and on that occasion Śambhu and Gaurī were placed on a swing. There used to be a big gathering at the Somanātha temple. A perusal of the prologue of *Dūtāṅgada* shows that King Kumārapāla was present on the occasion of the festival at the famous temple of Somanatha. Similar festivals took place in other Śaiva temples. A record of V. S. 1264/c. 1207 A.D. states that the feudatory King Jagamalla assigned a sum for the festival at two Śaiva temples in the town of Talajha.<sup>25</sup> Dramas used to be staged also on that day. We learn from the Dhar-praśasti of Arjunavarman<sup>26</sup> that the drama *Pārijātamañjarī* of Madana was staged during the Chaitra-parva, also called *Vasantotsava*.

On the same day of 14th Chaitra Śukla another festival known as *Damanakachaturdaśī* was held.<sup>27</sup> This festival appears to have been observed in Bengal, Mid-India and Rajputana. Jīmūtavāhana directed that Anaṅga is to be worshipped with flowers. But Hemādri states that the leaves of the Damana tree are to be offered to Śiva, Viṣṇu and Madana.<sup>28</sup> Inscriptions of the reigns of Paramāra Udayāditya<sup>29</sup> and of Queen Udalladevī dated V. S. 1294/c. 1237 A.D.<sup>30</sup> refer to the observance of the festival on that day. The day was sacred, and we find that the above-mentioned second inscription relates to the erection of temple of Vindhyeśvara on the occasion. Though the donor of the temple, Queen Udalladevī was born in Kanauj, it is noteworthy that Lakṣmīdhara does not mention this festival.

The dark half of the month of Chaitra was also full of festivities. Both Lakṣmīdhara and Chayḍeśvara<sup>31</sup> refer to a festival of the Jhallamallas or aboriginal tribes held between the first and fourth days of the dark half of Chaitra. This festivity has not been cited by any other *nibandhakāra*, not even by Hemādri. From the second and the fourth day, however, the followers of the Brāhmanical religion performed a *Mahotsava* with songs. On this occasion a serpent made of grass, was to be tied to a wood. This imaginary serpent was made to dance in villages and towns. On the third or fourth day it was torn to pieces. Those pieces were kept in every house, and worshipped secretly throughout the year.<sup>32</sup> On the fifth of the dark-half of the month Indians believed that the Earth<sup>33</sup> had menses like a woman. At present the Bengalees observe a similar festival known as *Ambubāchī* in the month of Āṣāḍha. Digging or ploughing of earth is strictly forbidden on these three days. Both the festivals seem to be a prelude to the sowing ceremony. According to Lakṣmīdhara women made stone images of Earth and anointed them for three days in the dark-half of Chaitra. They avoided flowers, ornaments and frankincense on these days. And then on the 8th Chaitra, the Brāhmaṇas bathed the images and

worshipped them. Musical instruments were played.<sup>34</sup> The devotees having bathed and decorated themselves tilled the land with ploughs and sowed seeds from a golden dish. When the seeds sprouted, the devotee ate them along with friends amidst songs and dances.<sup>35</sup> It appears then that on that same date the Brāhmaṇas controlled speech and abstained from reading the Vedas.<sup>36</sup> The image of the Earth goddess was thrown out of the windows by women-worshippers in the afternoon.

Two other strange festivals were held in the month of Chaitra. On the 14th of the dark fortnight of Chaitra,<sup>37</sup> Saṅkara was propitiated. People kept themselves awake throughout the night with the object of protecting the children from goblins and saw the dance of harlots. Fish, meat and plenty of rice and liquor were to be offered at the roots and holes of trees, grazing grounds, deserted houses, junctions of roads, terraces, rivers, temples and cremation grounds. On the day of *Amāvāsyā*, every one was asked to give plenty of food to dogs, after propitiating the Manes with *śrāddha*.

Alberuni and Gardīzī<sup>38</sup> mention that on the 2nd and 22nd days of the month of Chaitra, Agdus (?) and *Chaitra-Chashati* (?) holidays were observed. The former was in commemoration of a victory of the Kashmiri King Muttai over the Turks. This festival was observed by the Kashmiris alone. No such festival has been mentioned in any other book.

### *Vaiśākha* (April-May):

There were fewer festivals in the months of Vaiśākha and Jaiṣṭha in comparison with Chaitra. The month began with the worship of the fairy Irā.<sup>39</sup> Clothes and food were distributed to the wife, children, friends and servants. The water with which the fairy had been worshipped was drunk along with the food. On this occasion too, they had songs and dramatic performances. The third day of the bright fortnight of Vaiśākha was holy to Vāsudeva. According to the

*Brahma Purāṇa* quoted by Lakṣmīdhara and Chanḍeśvara,<sup>40</sup> Viṣṇu was to be offered barley, and Śaṅkara, Gaṅgā and the Himalayas were to be worshipped. Jīmūtavāhana and Chanḍeśvara quote the authority of *Viṣṇu*, *Bhaviṣya*, *Devī Purāṇas*, *Yama* and *Viṣṇudharmottara* in describing this festival<sup>41</sup> A fast in honour of Vāsudeva was undertaken on the 2nd of the fortnight, water and sweets were offered to the deities. As the manes were offered water and *tila*, the day was also known as *Akṣayatrīṭhīyā*. Even the Jaina writer Hemachandra refers to the practice of offering oblations on this date in his *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacharita*.<sup>42</sup> Lūnapāsaka, a feudatory ruler of the modern Bhilsa region, under the Chaulukya King Ajayapāla, granted a village to Śiva at Udayapura in Gwalior on the *Akṣayatrīṭhīyā* day.<sup>43</sup> We find that on the same day grants of villages were made to the Brāhmaṇas by the Gāhaḍavāla Kings Chandradeva<sup>44</sup> and Govindachandra.<sup>45</sup>

Alberuni and Gardizī refer to the celebration of Gaur-t-r (Gaurī-ṭrīṭhīyā ?) on the third Vaiśākha<sup>46</sup> It was observed by the ladies. On the occasion of the worship of Gaurī they fasted, washed and dressed themselves gaily. They also lighted lamps before the image of Gaurī and swayed on the swings. The information supplied by these foreign writers is correct to a large extent. The details of the worship, including fasting can also be found in Hemādri's *Chaturvargachintāmaṇi*.<sup>47</sup> But Hemādri puts the date *Gaurīvrata* on the third day of the bright half of Chaitra. He also does not mention the swing as a part of the festival. As the *Gaurīvrata* is not mentioned by the digest-makers of our period, it is quite likely that it was not in vogue in Northern India during the period under survey. Alberuni might have confused the date with the fourth day of the bright half of the month of Jyaiṣṭha.

The 7th Vaiśākha Śukla was notable for the worship of the river Ganges.<sup>48</sup> *Śarkarāsaptamī*<sup>49</sup> and the birth of the Buddha.<sup>50</sup> The *Śarkarāsaptamī* was celebrated in honour of

the Sun. On the same day an image of the Buddha was to be made and the temples were to be decorated. The monks were to be given books, meals and dress and the poor people were given flowers, clothes and rice. The worship was to continue for three days amidst dances and dramas. It is noteworthy that the Hindus accepted the Buddha in their pantheon but they celebrated his birthday on a wrong date on the 7th day of the bright half instead of the full moon day of Vaiśākha. *Tila* was offered on the Vaiśākha Pūrṇimā day to Vāsudeva, Dharmarāja and the manes. Lamps were burnt with *Tila* oil<sup>51</sup> Jimūtavāhana quoting *Viṣṇudharmottara* recommends that cooked rice, water, sweets and vegetables are to be offered to the people on that particular day.

Alberuni and Gardīzī<sup>52</sup> describe a strange ceremony which took place on the 10th Vaiśākha Śukla. The King invited the Brāhmanas. They went to the open spaces and lit up fires for sacrifices in "sixteen different spots and in four different groups." The fire raged till the day of the full moon. This festival is not referred to in any digest.

#### *Jyaiṣṭha* (May-June):

The first day of the bright fortnight of the month of Jyaiṣṭha began, according to Alberuni and Gardīzī,<sup>53</sup> with "throwing the first fruits of all seeds into the water in order to gain thereby a favourable prognostic." This custom is also unknown to the Indian digest-makers. The fourth of the bright fortnight was a holiday on account of the date of birth of Umā. Umā was worshipped by women for the sake of increase of fortune. It was celebrated amidst songs and dances and rewards were given<sup>54</sup> The eighth day was notable for the birth of Śuklā Devī, who killed the King of demons.<sup>55</sup> According to Bhoja and Jimūtavāhana,<sup>56</sup> the 10th day was known as *Daśaharā*. On this occasion the Ganges descended to the earth. Those who took their bath and gave away gifts became free from sins. But Lakṣmīdhara and Chandeśvara<sup>57</sup> put the date of the

descent of the Ganges as the 7th Vaiśākha Śukla. It seems that the Bengal and Malwa schools observed the festival on the 10th Jyaiṣṭha Śukla and the rest of Northern India on the 7th Vaiśākha Śukla in mediaeval times. This is also hinted at by Chaṇḍeśvara<sup>58</sup>. At present, however, the whole of India celebrates the descent of Gaṅgā on the 10th day of the bright half of Jyaiṣṭha.<sup>59</sup>

The twelfth day was known as *Matsyadvādaśī* or *Rāghavadvādaśī*.<sup>60</sup> Jyaiṣṭha Pūrṇimā, according to Alberuni and Gardīzī<sup>61</sup> was observed by women. These foreign writers do not give particulars of the festival known as *Rūpa-pañch* (?) or *Rūpa-mañch* (?). It seems that the day was the *Sāvitrīvrata* day. According to Bhoja, the author of *Rājamārtaṇḍa* and Chaṇḍeśvara<sup>62</sup>, the performance of this vow saved women from widowhood. Chaṇḍeśvara gives further details of the worship. A jar filled with rice, fruits, sugarcane plant was to be provided. A copper-plate was to be placed on the jar and on the plate was erected the images of Brahmā and Sāvitrī. Food and clothes were to be given to honest Brāhmaṇa couples.<sup>63</sup> In modern times the *Sāvitrīvrata* is also observed on the same day.<sup>64</sup>

In Orissa, however, Puruṣottama's image was taken round the streets on the same day. The festival was known as *Mahājyaiṣṭhī* festival, which has been described in *Brahma, Skanda* and *Agni Purāṇas*.<sup>65</sup> It is also mentioned in *Naiṣadhacharita*<sup>66</sup> of Śrīharṣa. This festival has not been mentioned in contemporary *nibandhas*. Bhoja in his *Rājamārtaṇḍa*<sup>67</sup> also tells us that the *Mahājyaiṣṭhī* festival was restricted to the area of Puruṣottama or Puri.

### *Āṣādhā* (June-July) :

The eighth day of the bright half of the month of *Āṣādhā* was auspicious for the worship of Gaṇeśa or Vināyaka. *Māṣa* pulses or barley used to be taken as food on this day. The festival was celebrated with vocal and instrumental

music.<sup>68</sup> Modern calendars do not show any such ceremony. No other festival was held in the dark half of Āṣāḍha excepting, as according to *Kālaviveka*, the worship of Śiva on the *Chaturdaśī*.<sup>69</sup>

In the bright half of Āṣāḍha there were many festivities. On the 7th day, when Bhāskara (Sun) was worshipped, people took food and drink ceremoniously.<sup>70</sup> On the 9th day there was fasting and the golden image of Durgā Indrānī was worshipped. The devotees were asked to give meals to the unmarried girls, women and Brāhmaṇas<sup>71</sup> according to one's capacity. This ceremony was also held on the 9th of the *Mārgaśīrṣa*.<sup>72</sup> On the occasion of Viṣṇu going to sleep, the devotees fasted and kept themselves awake during the night of the 11th day, worshipped him on the 12th and arranged for music and dance<sup>73</sup> on the 13th. Lakṣmīdhara and Chanḍeśvara prescribe that the actors (*raṅgaḍvīno naṭādayaḥ*) are to be given money according to one's capacity.<sup>74</sup> There was again another fasting on the full moon day. Alberuni mentions this fasting day as holy to Vāsu-deva.<sup>75</sup>

Another festival took place in the month of Āṣāḍha. On the occasion of the *Dakṣināyana*, the clouds were to be worshipped. The Brāhmaṇas were to be offered milk, barley powder, camphor, sugar, fruits and vegetables.<sup>76</sup> Alberuni tells us that throughout the month of Āṣāḍha alms were given. Householders began using new vessels on this day.<sup>77</sup> Chanḍeśvara, on the authority of *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, prescribes restraint on food in all the nights of this month.<sup>78</sup> A festival known as *Bhāuam*, in honour of Gaurī in this month, is mentioned only by Hemachandra in his *Deśinamanālā*.<sup>79</sup> Hemādri does not mention such a festival. But this festival continued in Gujarat till the time of Forbes.<sup>80</sup> It is quite possible that the festival mentioned by Hemachandra is identical with the *Ubhayanavamī* mentioned by Chanḍeśvara<sup>81</sup> and Hemādri<sup>82</sup> which we have already discussed.



*Śrāvaṇa* (July-August):

Lakṣmīdhara mentions only one important festival in the month of Śrāvaṇa. The day on which the asterism, Rohiṇī and Śrāvaṇa, occurred, Viṣṇu was to be worshipped. There was to be play and partaking of meals along with relatives. If girls desired good husbands, they were to participate in the tournaments in water.<sup>83</sup> The twelfth of the bright half of the month of Śrāvaṇa was known as *Buddhadvādasi*.<sup>84</sup> This day is not mentioned either by Jīmūtavāhana or Lakṣmīdhara. However, a golden image of the Buddha was to be worshipped and then offered to a Brāhmaṇa.<sup>85</sup> It was a day of fasting. Modern Bengali calendar puts the date of *Buddhadvādasi* on the full moon day of Jyaisṭha.

Alberuni describes the full moon day of Śrāvaṇa as holy to Somanatha. Banquets were given to Brāhmaṇas on this day.<sup>86</sup> Hemachandra states that on the fourteenth day of the bright half of Śrāvaṇa the *Voralli* festival is held.<sup>87</sup> How or in whose honour it was held, is not known to us. The Nadol plate dated V.S. 1218/1161 A.D. states that on the above-mentioned day the Chāhamāna feudatory chieftain Alhaṇadeva made gifts to the Brāhmaṇas and *Gurus*.<sup>88</sup> The King worshipped Sun and Iśāna (Śiva) on the occasion. It is difficult to agree with Dr. Asoke Majumdar that it was purely a Śaiva festival.

*Bhādra* (August-September):

Both the halves of the month of Bhādra were important for varied and colourful festivals. On the first day of the dark-half began the *Karāra* (?) festival which continued for seven days.<sup>90</sup> According to Alberuni and Gardīzī people used to adorn and feed children and to play with various animals. On the eighth day falls the anniversary of the birth of Kṛṣṇa\* Alberuni and Gardīzī as well as Chaṇḍeśvara and

\* Sri Aiyangar in his Intro. p. 47 to Vol. III of *Kṛityakalpataru* wrongly puts the month of Śrāvaṇa.

Jimūtavāhana describe the exact position of the planets on this day. The moon stands in her fourth station, Rohiṇī. Two Muslim scholars designate the festival as *Guna-lahid*<sup>91</sup> (?). Alberuni, however, observes that besides the constellation of stars, the day must be the 8th of the dark-half. He further comments "such a day does not occur in every year, but only in certain ones of a large number of years".<sup>92</sup> But while these foreign writers state that it is a day of fasting, Lakṣmīdhara observes that it is permissible to take fruits and milk.<sup>93</sup> Both Bhoja and Jimūtavāhana<sup>94</sup> call the day of the birth of Kṛṣṇa as *Jāyanti*. Fasting is to be undertaken only when the Rohiṇī star appears on the *aṣṭamī* day. The former<sup>95</sup> clearly states that fasts are never to be observed in the Rohiṇī *nakṣatra*. Lakṣmīdhara gives some details of the festival. Devotees used to keep awake throughout the night and witness singing and dancing. Next day, on the ninth, the womenfolk dressed in red robes and decked with flowers and ornaments were to bring the images of Kṛṣṇa, Devakī and Yośodā to the bank of a river. After they had taken their bath, women used to enter their residence and take barley, sugarcane etc.

On the ninth day of the dark-half of Bhādra the procession of the car of Durgā started.<sup>96</sup> The festival as described by Chandeśvara appears to have been observed solely by the King. The car was to be decorated with clothes, flag bearing lion's emblem, white umbrellas, feathers of peacocks, bells and other things. The Brāhmaṇas were fed on the previous day. On the ninth day Durgā was placed on the car. Animals were sacrificed and brave persons were to throw their swords towards the east. They also danced before the deity with other weapons. Then began the worship of the deity by the Vedic Brāhmaṇas in the palace of the King amidst sound of conches. The citizens gathered at the eastern gate. Then the car was taken out and the king worshipped Durgā for one day each in the south, west and northern directions. The Śūdras were allowed to worship the goddess but they were

forbidden to get on the car.<sup>97</sup> The maid-servants of the royal household, however, surrounded the deity on the car. The festival continued till the fourteenth day and during these six days special arrangements were made for songs and dances.<sup>98</sup> The car returned to its original place on the thirteenth.

The days of the dark-half of the month of Bhādra were and are known as *pitripakṣa*. These days were sacred to the Manes and were to be celebrated with a real *śrāddha*<sup>99</sup> especially on the *amāvasyā*. Alberuni and Gardīzī refer to the *Pitripakṣa*.<sup>100</sup> Hemachandra calls the same period as *Mahā-lavakkho*.<sup>101</sup> Abhayatilaka Gaṇi in his commentary on *Dvyāś-ṛaya* states that during the period a man has to live like a Brahmachārin and abstain from betels, tooth brush, oils for anointing body or cooking, women, medicine and food offered by others.<sup>102</sup> The Kashmiris on this day deposited the bones of the dead, who had died during the year, in the sacred Gaṅgā lake.<sup>103</sup> The days sacred to the Manes were observed in Rajputana even in the time of Tod.<sup>104</sup> It is interesting to note here that the day was regarded as an auspicious one as on this very day in V. S. 1232/1175 A.D. the *Jātakarman* ceremony of prince Hariśchandra, son of King Jayachandra Gāhaḍavāla, took place.<sup>105</sup>

In the bright-half of Bhādra occurred a number of festivals. The ladies fasted and worshipped Śiva or his wife on the fourth day. They also offered *gur*, salt and *pūpa* to their father-in-law and mother-in-law.<sup>106</sup> This day is known as *Haritūlikā*, sacred to Pārvatī, according to Bhoja's *Rājamārtaṇḍa*.<sup>107</sup> The worship of serpents on the 5th Śrāvaṇa śukla and the 5th Bhādra śukla freed one from fear of snakes. The ceremony was observed amidst songs and dances.<sup>108</sup> The day was also known as *Rṣipañchamī*. On the sixth and seventh days, when Kṛṣṇa won fame, the devotees were to distribute alms to servants, friends, and wives.<sup>109</sup> Chaṇḍeśvara further directed that one should not use oil on the sixth day. The same writer informs us that on the 6th day, the Sun has to be worshipped and *Pāyasa* and *gur* are to be taken.<sup>110</sup>

Alberuni and Gardīzī also regarded the day as sacred to the Sun. People observed a fast on the previous day, that is, the fifth. Details of the ceremony have been given by these foreign writers. "They ancient the solar rays, and in particular the rays which enter through the windows, with various kinds of balsmic ointment and place upon them odoriferous plants and flowers".<sup>111</sup> It is interesting to observe here that Jīmūtavāhana and Lakṣmīdhara do not mention this date as sacred to the Sun. It may be suggested that the Sun worship was prevalent in Mithilā only and not in Eastern U.P. and Bengal on this date. The eighth day of the bright-half of the month was notable for several festivities. According to Chaṇḍeśvara, if men and specially womenfolk observe fasting and worship Śaṅkara and Ganeśa with grass, date palms, cocoanut and other fruits on that date, known as *Durvāṣṭamī* the worshipper would be rewarded with learning, progeny and wealth.<sup>112</sup> This *Durvāṣṭamī* festival is probably identical with that of *Dhurvagriha*(?) or *Daruphar*(?) of Alberuni and Gardīzī which was also observed on the eighth day "when the moonlight has reached half of its development." On the occasion, the devotees "wash themselves and eat well-growing grain-fruit so that their children may be healthy. The women celebrate this festival when they are pregnant and desire to have children".<sup>113</sup> Gardīzī however, tells us<sup>114</sup> that the devotees ate grapes but did not give these to their sons. It was on this day that the Gāhaḍavāla King Jayachchandra performed the *Nāmakaraṇa* ceremony of his son Hariśchandra at Banaras and granted two villages to Mahāpandita Hriṣīkeśaśarman.<sup>115</sup>

From ancient times right upto the seventeenth century, one of the political festivals was the *Indradhvajochchrāya* or raising of the flagstaff of Indra. We learn from the Ādiparva of the *Mahābhārata* that Indra presented a banner (*dhvaja*) to King Uparichara of the Chedi country. The King displayed the pole in a public festival. Indra was pleased and pledged that the King who celebrated such a festival would

be free from all calamities and be assured of victories. The belief persisted in the days of the Gāhaḍavāla King Govindachandra. Lakṣmīdhara, quoting the *Devī Purāṇa*, says that the performance of the ceremony with proper rituals, destroys all threats to kingdom and ensure constant victory. The country also never suffers from paucity of rain.<sup>116</sup> The time prescribed for raising the staff, according to Varāhamihira's *Bṛīhatsaṃhitā*<sup>117</sup> was the eighth of the light-half of Bhādra. Lakṣmīdhara, quoting the *Devī Purāṇa*, gives the above-mentioned date as well as the day in which the constellation-Śravaṇa occurs in the bright-half of Āśvina.<sup>118</sup> Jīmūtavāhana<sup>119</sup> discusses the date in detail and fixes it with reference to the constellation. The staff was to be raised when the moon was in Śravaṇa *nakṣatra* and the *visarjana* was to take place at the end of Bharanī *nakṣatra*.<sup>120</sup> Bhoja also recommends the same dates. It was the duty and privilege of the king to raise the flag-staff with due pomp. A graphic description has been given by Bhoja in *Rājamārtaṇḍa*.<sup>121</sup> The King himself with his priests had to guard the flag-staff throughout the night on the day it was raised. Greatest care was taken while cutting down the wood meant for the pole and transporting it. It was not to become a roosting place for inauspicious birds like crows and pigeons. It was believed that various misfortunes like the death of the king and queen and famine fall on the people, if any part of the staff suffered breakage or even scratches appeared on it. Young men brought the pole to the king's palace, trumpets were blown and the flag was raised amidst the chanting of Vedic hymns by Brāhmaṇas, the blowing of conches by the association of prostitutes,<sup>122</sup> (*veśyāsamgha*), presence of soldiers, courtiers and prominent citizens of the country. Songs and dances heightened the festivity. The streets were adorned with flags and auspicious plantain and sugarcane plants. Literature shows that the raising of the Flag Staff was the signal for commencement of popular festivities. This ceremony, however, is not included by Nīlakaṇṭha, the celebrated commenta-

tor of the Mahābhārata, apparently because India had lost her independence in his time. It was, hence, meaningless for a subject nation to celebrate a political festival.

From the digests we learn that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the festival was observed in all parts of Northern India. Hemachandra in his *Dvyāśraya*<sup>123</sup> mentions the Indra-pūjā. He and his commentator Abhayatilaka Gani state that the festival lasted from the eighth day of the bright-half to the full moon-day of the month of Āśvin. It is interesting to observe here that the purpose of the festival as stated by these writers is different from the views of the above-mentioned *nibandhakāras*. In Gujarat area it was held in order to get a good harvest of paddy. In Kashmir the day was named as *Indradvādaśī*. The *Nīlamata Purāṇa*<sup>124</sup> mentions the *Mahādvādaśī* festival which falls on the twelfth day of the bright-fortnight of the month of Bhādra. Probably *Mahādvādaśī* and *Indradvādaśī* were identical. The *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* gives an interesting account of festivities on the occasion. Kashmiri kings used to distribute presents on that day to the victors in the tournaments, which were held in the royal palace.<sup>125</sup> Many lost their lives and limbs on this occasion. "Soldiers of noble race" observes Kalhaṇa, "who had left their homes, as if in exultation, were carried away mutilated from the palace court by their relatives.... The women, when their husbands returned (alive) after going to the royal palace, thought that they had gained a day but otherwise never felt safe".<sup>126</sup>

The rest of the bright-half of Bhādra marked the observation of the following festivals. On the ninth day, Janārdana, Durgā, Gaṇeśa (Dhanada), Varuṇa and the trees (Vanaspati) were worshipped with wheat.<sup>127</sup> On the tenth day the Brāhmaṇas were offered fruits and vegetables.<sup>128</sup> Women were to be decorated with ornaments and dress. One acquired great merit by bathing at the confluence of the Vitastā and the Sindhu (Indus) rivers on this day. The occasion was also utilised in the honouring of dancers and actors. The twelfth

day or *Vijayadvādaśī* was sacred to Janārdana.<sup>129</sup> If one made a gift of rice, *gur*, *kṣīra*, *ghee*, clothes, water, gold and silver, elephants, horses, chariots, conveyances, umbrellas or shoes on that day, the gods were pleased. One could also hear the recital of the Purāṇas and Vedas. Drinking, dancing and recital of music went on throughout the day.<sup>130</sup> In Gujarat the 10th day was the occasion for *Neḍḍaria* festival.<sup>131</sup> On the previous day, that is, the eleventh, there was a fasting in honour of Kṛṣṇa and a bath, at Prayāga or other confluences of rivers, on the twelfth was considered to be meritorious.<sup>132</sup>

Another festival called *Gaihat* (or *Kabhat* ?) took place on the 6th of Bhādra, when people gave food to prisoners. This festival has been mentioned by Alberuni and Gardīzī.<sup>133</sup>

#### *Aśvin or Āśvāyuja* (September-October):

The month of Āśvin was probably the busiest month so far as Hindu rituals and ceremonies were concerned. On the third, fourth and fifth of the dark-half took place the worship of Varuṇa and Vasudhā or Earth. The sixth day was observed by some as the birth-day of Skanda. Lakṣmīdhara advised that the sons should be dressed and given ornaments on this day.<sup>134</sup> During the worship of Vaiṣṇavī on the eighth day one was advised particularly to bathe and decorate oneself with good clothes and ornaments. Instrumental music and dances were arranged and water sports continued for such a long time that the vermilion marks were almost obliterated. Wheat and *gur* were to be taken on the occasion.<sup>135</sup> Alberuni also mentions an almost similar festivity called *Aśoka* or *Ahoi* on the 23rd Āśvāyuja when "the moon stands in the seventh station, Punarvasu. It is a day of merriment and of wrangling".<sup>136</sup> Chaṇḍeśvara quoting the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* recommends the holding of the car festival of Durgā on the 9th day.<sup>137</sup> The image of Durgā was to be made of gold. The devotees remained awake throughout the night and on the tenth day a feast took place.

The celebrations during the bright-half of the month began with the worship of Sati on the fourth day. It was a festival for women,<sup>138</sup> who, being dressed in clothes and adorned in *Kumkuma*, paid respects to sister, mother and husband. Horses and elephants were adored<sup>139</sup> from the fourth to the ninth day. The eighth day was holy to Bhadrakālī who destroyed the sacrifices of Dakṣa. On this occasion one was to wear white clothes and ornaments, eat fruits and rice and drink wine. The Brāhmaṇas were to be given meat and other things. Keeping awake in the night, one was to worship different kinds of offensive and defensive weapons and musical instruments in the temple of Durgā. A strange ceremony was the cutting off of an imitation cock and goat made of wood.<sup>140</sup> The worship of Durgā continued till the tenth day. While Jimūtavāhana and Lakṣmīdhara prescribe a two-day festival, only on the ninth and tenth, Bhoja and Chaṇḍeśvara recommended the worship from the seventh to the tenth day of the bright half of Śukla. The days on which Durgā's worship in the month of Āśvin were held were known in Hemachandra's *Dvyāśraya*<sup>141</sup> as *Navāha* which his commentator Abhyatīlaka Gaṇi calls *Navarātra*. These names of the festive days are probably identical with *Mahānavamī* of Alberuni and Gardīzī.<sup>142</sup> On the occasion animals were sacrificed. Alberuni makes the additional observation that in case of failure to get kids to sacrifice, the devotees "will sometimes pounce upon whomsoever he meets and kill him". On the tenth day was celebrated in Eastern India a Saturnalian festival called Śāvoratsava which has been described by Jimūtavāhana<sup>143</sup> and Chaṇḍeśvara.<sup>144</sup>

The four succeeding days, eleventh to the fourteenth, were sacred to Viṣṇu.<sup>145</sup> The eleventh day was a day of fasting. On the twelfth day, also called *Padmanābhadvādaśivrata* day according to Chaṇḍeśvara, the golden image of Padmanābha was worshipped. The full moon day, however, was important for a number of festivities. On that day, according to Lakṣmīdhara,<sup>147</sup> people dressed themselves in festive attires.



cleaned up and decorated the roads as also the areas surrounding their houses. People were asked not to take their meals during the day. Women, old men, children and ignorant people were to be fed on the occasion.<sup>148</sup> Brāhmaṇas were to be given vegetarian dishes. The full moon night was more colourful. Songs and dances were arranged. Different types of sports were held before the fire. Bhoja and Jimūta-vāhana recommend the observance of *Kojāgarapūrnimā* on the full moon night in Āśvin.<sup>149</sup> People, keeping awake throughout the night, used to worship Lakṣmī and Indra.\*

Two other festivals were held on the first and second days following the full moon in Āśvin. The first one is known as the gift of *Kāntāradīpa*<sup>150</sup> celebrated on the night following the full moon in the month of Āśvin. It has been described by Lakṣmīdhara and Chaṇḍeśvara. *Kāntāra* means a jungle or desolate area,<sup>151</sup> the ritual was meant for "relief of disembodied spirits (*preta*) and the manes (*pitarah*) and earning thereby benedictions and divine blessings." The celebrations began with the lighting of a lamp with a prayer addressed to Dharma as Viṣṇu and Śiva. The lamp was to be lighted throughout the month of Kārttika. A rough wooden image of the sun of the height of a man was installed at a distance from the house of a celebrant. A lamp made of four with big wicks and filled with clarified butter was to be placed on the head of the image. Before the image, geometrical figures (*Maṇḍala*) were drawn. Eight vessels full of water were to be placed one for each quarter and angle of the *Maṇḍala* and a *homa* was to be performed. Cows, lands, gold, silver, clothes, fruits, barley, rice, house, chariots, beds were pres-

\* Cf. Account of the festival in Śrināthāchārya Chūḍāmaṇi's *Kṛityatattvārṇava* fols. 71B-72B when dice was played and friends and relatives had to be gratified with pressed rice (*chipīṭaka*) and preparations of cocoanuts (HB I 607). These descriptions do not occur in *Kālaviveka*. It is interesting to observe here that the ceremonies tally with the observance of modern Lakṣmīpūjā on the *Kojāgarapūrnimā* night in Bengal, but not in Bihar.

cribed as gifts to the Brāhmaṇas on the occasion. The Brāhmaṇas were also offered lamps. But these lamps were not taken away by them. They were to be placed in the hollows of trees, desolate houses, Buddhist temples, cremation grounds, caves, banks of rivers and in the houses of poor people. The more interesting part of the ritual was that the celebrant was first to please the women folk with gifts of ornaments and then to light the lamps.<sup>152</sup> On the second day following Āśvin Pūrṇimā or on Uttara Pratipada was celebrated in the Uttar Pradesh and Mithila a Saturnalia known as *Udakasevā Mahotsava*.<sup>153</sup> A description of this festival is discussed in Chapter XV.

Lakṣmīdhara mentions a harvest festival<sup>154</sup> in the month of Āśvin, but the date is not definitely fixed. On the occasion of the reaping of the new harvest, one was to go to the fields amidst the play of musical instruments and dances. A fire was to be lit up, a *homa* performed and a feast arranged with the newly harvested rice.

Another festival of political significance was the *Nīrājana* or waving of lights before horses and elephants. It finds prominence in *Bṛīhatsaṃhitā*.<sup>155</sup> The *Yuktikalpataru* states that a big ornamental arch of some holy tree was to be erected in the north-east of the capital.<sup>156</sup> Round the necks of horses threads smeared with saffron paste were to be tied. The *Yuktikalpataru* does not prescribe any particular date for the festival but the *Rājamārtanda* gives the date as the eighth day of Āśvin Śukla.<sup>157</sup> Kautilya, however, prescribes that on the ninth day of Āśvin or at the beginning and close of invasions or when diseases break out, the *Nīrājana* festival was to be held. Chaṇḍeśvara prescribes the festival on the second day of the bright half of Āśvin and recommends its continuance for seven days.<sup>158</sup> No horse was to be struck with a whip or addressed harshly during the period. The people were enjoined to blow conches, beat drums and sing songs before the elephants and horses. Alberuni notes that on the 15th Āśvin, when the moon stands in Revatī, a festival known as

Puhai (?) takes place, when the people "wrangle with each other and play with animals".<sup>159</sup> The date tallies with one of the dates given by Bhoja in his *Yuktikalpataru*.<sup>160</sup> But Alberuni's information that the day was holy to Vāsudeva, because "his uncle Kamsa had ordered him into his presence for the purpose of wrangling" cannot be corroborated by any contemporary native evidence.

Possibly in Gujarat area alone, a festival called *Polao* was held in this month when the husband ate a cake from the hands of his wife.<sup>161</sup>

*Kārtika* (October-November):

During the dark night or *amāvasyā* in the month of *Kārtika* was observed the *Dīvālī* festival. Lakṣmīdhara and Chaṇḍeśvara quoting the *Brahma Purāṇa*, inform us that on that day was observed the *Sukhasupūkā*.<sup>162</sup> Bhoja in his *Rājamārtanḍa*<sup>163</sup> calls it as *Sukharātri*. People did not take their meals in the morning. Lakṣmī was worshipped in the dusk and lamps were lit up on the trees, in temples, roads, cremation-grounds, river banks, tops of hills and also in the houses. Gifts and food were offered to the Brāhmaṇas and to the hungry people. People on that occasion, wore new clothes and ornaments and feted womenfolk, learned men and friends. Lakṣmī is said to be getting up from sleep on this night and therefore, Jimūtavāhana, like Bhoja, calls it *Sukharātri*.<sup>164</sup> The occasion was celebrated by lighting lamps in houses and relatives were shown respect with offerings of flowers. Chaṇḍeśvara further informs us that the people of Gauḍa or Eastern India worshipped Kuvera in the dusk of the *Sukharātri* day. A perusal of the *Dvyāsraya*<sup>165</sup> also shows that the *amāvasyā* of the month of *Kārtika* was known as *Dīpotsava*. And Hemachandra further tells us that the fortnight which followed the Āśvin Pūrṇimā was known as *Dīpotsava-pakṣa* or fortnight of the illumination festival. Abhayatilaka, the commentator, explains *Dīpotsava* as *Dīpālikā*. Hemachandra in his *Deśināmamālā*<sup>166</sup> has shown that the words *Dīvālī* and *Dīpā-*

*likā* are equivalents of the *Deśi* word *jakkharatti*. *Sukharātri*, *Sukhasuptikā*, *dīpotsava*, *Dīpālikā* and *jakkharatti* were synonymous terms. The *Dīvālī* is an old festival, which is mentioned in the *Purāṇas* like *Nīlamata*, *Skanda*, *Varāha* and *Bhaviṣya* and quoted by Hemādri, Nāgānanda and *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana.<sup>167</sup> Description of the festival is found in non-Brāhmaṇical literature too. Somadeva in his *Yaśastilaka-champū* composed in 959 A.D. describes how the houses were whitewashed and adorned with white flags and rows of lights. He also speaks of "the women excited by gambling, the gaiety of courtesans and the sweet notes of music."<sup>168</sup> Alberuni states that, "the first Kārtika or new moon's day when the sun marches in Libra, is called *Dīvālī*. Then people bathe, dress festively, make presents to each other of betel leaves and areca-nuts; they ride to the temples to give alms and play merrily with each other till noon. In the night they light a number of lamps in every place so that the air is perfectly clear. The cause of this festival is that Lakṣmī, the wife of Vāsudeva, once a year liberates Bali, the son of Virochana, therefore the festival is called *Balirājya*, i.e. the principality of Bali".<sup>169</sup> Gardīzī<sup>170</sup> also makes a similar statement. The *Bali Pājā*, however, did not occur in the *Dīvālī* night. It was held on the day following the dark night or *amāvasyā* of the month of Kārtika. Jimūtavāhana, Lakṣmidhara and Chan-deśvara unanimously state that the festival celebrated on *Pratipada* after Kārtika *amāvasyā* was *Balirājyapravartinī*.<sup>171</sup> In the morning of this day people took part in gambling. The win or loss in the gamble portended good or bad fortune for the year.<sup>172</sup> The festival is called *Dyūta-Pratipada* in *Kṛtya-tattvārṇava*. Songs, both vocal and instrumental, are prescribed. People dressed themselves gaily and fed their friends. The night was spent with equal mirth and gaiety. Friends, relatives and Brāhmaṇas were honoured with gifts of new clothes. Further, the husband and wife put on festive clothes, ornaments and garlands and spent the night in a room, lit up with lamps and scented with sandal-wood and other perfumes. The bed was

decorated and strewn with flowers. This festival was current also on the same day in Gujarat area. Hemachandra in his *Dvyāśraya*<sup>173</sup> calls it as *Bali-mahā*, which has been explained by his commentator Abhayatilaka Gaṇi as *Balirājyadina*.

On the second day of the bright half of the month of Kārtika, the sisters fed their brothers, who in their turn, gave ornaments, clothes etc., to their sisters. This ceremony is called *Bhrātridvīṭvā* by Bhoja<sup>174</sup> and Jīmūtavāhana and *Yamadvīṭvā* by Chāṇḍeśvara.<sup>176</sup> As Lakṣmīdhara does not mention this, it is very likely that it was not observed in Eastern U.P. in the eleventh century. This festival, however, was current in Mahārāṣṭra and South India, because Hemādri<sup>177</sup> mentions it.

The other days of the bright-half of Kārtika like the fourth, eighth, ninth or eleventh were also festive days. The eighth day was a Śākta festival in Bengal in honour of the universal mother, now called *Jagaddhātṛīpūjā*.<sup>178</sup> Alberuni points out that on the eleventh of the bright-half, people observe the *Deotthini* in commemoration of the waking up of Vāsudeva. It was a day of fasting and people "soil themselves with dung of cows, and break fasting (on the twelfth) by feeding upon a mixture of Cow's milk, urine and dung."<sup>179</sup> The correctness of his description is corroborated by the account of the above-mentioned festival in *Rājamārtanḍa* of Bhoja, *Niyatakālakāṇḍa* and the *Kṛityaratnākara*.<sup>180</sup> It was a great festival. People fasted and in the night the Vedas and Purāṇas were recited. Songs and dances came as a welcome relief. The Vaiṣṇavas spoke on the life and activities of Vāsudeva. People offered vegetables and a variety of fruits to the deity. On the twelfth day, at day-break Vāsudeva was bathed with *ghee*, oil, and honey. Other rituals then followed.<sup>182</sup> An inscription of a Chaulukya feudatory ruler named Vijalladeva dated 1173 A.D. shows that this chief fasted on the occasion.<sup>181</sup> That this fasting was observed in Gujarat can be testified to by the statement of Hemachandra.<sup>184</sup> The fourteenth day or the full moon day was an important one for a number of reasons. First, after a bath, the women-folk worshipped the fruit-bearing

trees. It was a peculiar custom that the offerings were given to the mother of one child first and then to the bird. The ceremony came to a close with the feeding of friends, relatives and servants.<sup>185</sup> Chandeśvara calls the festival, the worship of Ekāṅga. Secondly, Vāsudeva and other deities were worshipped on this day. Lamps were lit on the occasion and people offered varieties of food to the Brāhmaṇas and deities. They themselves, however, had nothing but milk. Lakṣmīdhara recommends that during the five days commencing from the *ekādaśī* or the eleventh day, one should neither kill nor cause injury to animals.

The fourteenth day of the bright-half of the month of Kārtika was notable for the *Kaumudīmahotsava*, which was held in honour of Śiva. In modern Bīnar the Sonepur fair commences on this day. However, Lakṣmīdhara, quoting the *Skanda Purāṇa*, tells us that the King took the lead in organising the festival.<sup>187</sup> Songs and dances went on. Dramas were staged. Every house had to be whitewashed or cleaned and banners flaunted at prominent places. The streets were strewn with flowers. At night the streets and houses were illuminated with lamps, fed with adequate quantity of *ghee* or oil. It is necessary to state here that the festival must have been fairly popular even in North-western India. Alberuni states that when the full moon is perfect they give banquets.<sup>188</sup> That the festival was popular in the Narmadā region during the period under survey, can be proved by an inscription of the feudatory ruler Vaijalladeva dated VS 1231/1173 A.D.<sup>189</sup> Here, of course, the ruler worshipped both Śiva and Viṣṇu on the occasion.

*Mārgaśīrṣa (Agrahāyana)* (November-December):

According to Lakṣmīdhara, the new year began on the *Pratipada* day of the month of Mārgaśīrṣa in the Kṛita era. On this day Kāśmīra is said to have been built. The occasion was commemorated by songs and gifts of new clothes and ornaments.<sup>190</sup> Alberuni<sup>191</sup> however puts the date of the beginning of Kṛita era on the third Vaiśākha.

All other festive days of this month were in the bright-half. Alberuni and Gardīzī inform us that on the third day of the month, women observed a festival called *Guvāna-bārij* (?) sacred to Gaurī.<sup>192</sup> They assembled in the houses of rich men to worship the silver-image of Gaurī and played with one another. This festival is however not mentioned in any contemporary digest. It is however referred to by the fourteenth century *nibandhakāra* Chaṇḍeśvara<sup>193</sup> and the South Indian Hemādri.<sup>194</sup> From their accounts it is evident that the day on which Gaurī was worshipped must have been in the bright-half—a fact not mentioned by Alberuni. On the seventh day of the bright-half *Mitrasaptamī* was celebrated in honour of the Sun called Mitra.<sup>195</sup> The devotees fasted on the sixth day, taking only fruits and spent the night amidst songs. The festival continued on the seventh and eighth days. During these two days they took a preparation of powdered rice and honey. The eleventh and twelfth days were sacred to Vāsudeva. The eleventh was a day of fast and the actual worship came on the twelfth. This festival is mentioned by the Bengali and Maithila writers but not by Lakṣmīdhara.<sup>196</sup> On the fourteenth day or on the full moon-day, the *Himapūjā* was celebrated.<sup>197</sup> Alberuni and Gardīzī rightly observe that it was a festival of women.<sup>198</sup> Lakṣmīdhara also says the same thing. He further tells us that animals were sacrificed. Cows were to be given salt during the whole of the day. The mother, father's sister and daughters were shown respect. Along with the worship of *Hima* or dews, the Sthānanāga was worshipped with flowers, perfumes and fruits. When prayers were offered to Śyāmādevī, the event was signalled by sharing delicacies with friends, relatives and servants, and one had to hear songs. As on the occasion of the *Udakasevām:ahotsava* so also on this day, they drank wine. Witnessing the dance of harlots is also prescribed.<sup>199</sup> The Bengal school recommends the observance of the *Pāṣāṇa-Chaturdaśī* and eating of cakes on the full-moon night.<sup>200</sup>

*Pauṣa* (December-January):

Lakṣmīdhara mentions two festivals falling in the dark-half of the month of Pauṣa. On the eighth day people took vegetables (*tāka*).<sup>201</sup> Alberuni mentions this festival as *Sakartam* when they took turnips.<sup>202</sup> The eleventh and the twelfth days were holy to Nārāyaṇa.<sup>203</sup> Chaṇḍeśvara<sup>204</sup> calls it *Kūrmadvā-daṣī* which was observed in the *Śuklapakṣa* or the bright half.

Several festivals were held also in the bright half of Pauṣa. On the sixth day a fast according to Alberuni was observed in honour of the Sun<sup>205</sup> The same writer informs us that a festival called *Aṣṭaka* was held on the eighth day when Brāhmaṇas were offered "dishes prepared from the plant *Atriplex hortensis*".<sup>206</sup> Chaṇḍeśvara,<sup>207</sup> quoting *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* also says that the day was holy to Mahādeva. Brāhmaṇas were specially fed on the occasion. It was a Śaiva festival. After the Brāhmaṇas, Śaivas and Pāśupatas had been fed, Mahādeva was placed on a car. The Pāśupatas danced along the road through which the car was taken. On the full moon day as many as five deities viz. Viṣṇu, Puraṇḍara, Soma, Puṣa and Bṛhaspati were worshipped<sup>208</sup> On this occasion, too, people put on gala dress, used new clothes and ate delicious and wholesome dishes prepared with *ghee*, as well as *pāyasa*.

*Māgha* (January-February):

The eighth, twelfth and the fourteenth days of the dark-half of Māgha were days of festival. It is interesting to observe here that meat was offered to the Manes on the eighth day.<sup>209</sup> The twelfth day was held sacred because Yama dedicated the *tila* seed and it shot forth from the body of Viṣṇu. So the temples were lit up with the *tila* oil and the people offered and took *tila* on that day.<sup>210</sup> Kalhaṇa tells us of its observance in Kāśhmīr.<sup>211</sup> The fourteenth day was also important for a Śākta festival, called *Raṇantīchaturdaṣī*, sacred to Kālī.<sup>212</sup>



Coming to the bright half, the third day was holy to Gaurī. Alberuni and Gardīzī give a vivid description of the festival.<sup>213</sup> It was known as *Gaur-t-r* or *Mahatri* (*Māgha-irīṭiyā* ?). On this occasion women only and not men, observed a fast. The women-folk used to worship Gaurī in the house of the most important personality in the area and offered costly dresses, pleasant perfumes and nice dishes. Then the women put 108 jugs full of water at each meeting-place and "after the water has become cool, they wash with it four times at the four quarters of that night".<sup>214</sup> Next day, that is on the fourth, they gave banquets, received guests, and made presents "to the nearest relatives of their husbands." A perusal of the *Kṛtyaratnākara* confirms the statements of the foreign writers Alberuni and Gardīzī. Chaṇḍeśvara calls the festival as *Rasakalyāṇīvratan*.<sup>215</sup> But unlike Alberuni he does not state that the women took their bath in the four quarters of the night in the water of 108 jugs. Lakṣmīdhara too mentions the festival as being observed by women specially. But he puts the date of the festival only on the fourth day of the bright fortnight of the month of Māgha.<sup>216</sup> According to Chaṇḍeśvara the fourth and fifth days called *Varachaturthī* and *Śrīpañchamī* were holy to Vināyaka.<sup>217</sup> Jīmūtavāhana also recommends the worship of Gaṇeśa (Vināyaka) on the fourth day only. He also states that it was a day of fast, and the women worshipped the *Guru* and King on the occasion.<sup>218</sup> These days were also sacred to Śrī according to Bhoja.<sup>219</sup> Jīmūtavāhana and Chaṇḍeśvara. The seventh day according to all the contemporary digest-makers were sacred to the Sun named Puṣā.<sup>220</sup> Though it was a day of fast yet people had songs and dances. Jīmūtavāhana quoting *Matsya Purāṇa* tells us that as the sun is associated with car the day is called *Rathasaptamī*.<sup>221</sup> The *Rathasaptamī* is mentioned in inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas<sup>222</sup> and Kalachuris of Ratanpur.<sup>223</sup> The eleventh and twelfth days were sacred to the Vaiṣṇavas. The former was a day of fast and on the latter day the golden

image of Varāha was worshipped. The digests of mediaeval North India do not mention any festival on the full moon-day. It was a day for offering *tila* to the manes.<sup>225</sup> But Alberuni states that this day called *Chamaha*(?), Indians lighted lamps "on all high places".<sup>226</sup> This festival is not mentioned by Gardīzi.

Alberuni and Gardīzi mention two other festivals in the month of Māgha. In a festival called *Mansartaku* observed on the twenty-third, people treated guests to meat and large black peas.<sup>227</sup> On the twentyninth "when there is only a remainder of 3 day-minutes, i.e.  $1\frac{1}{4}$  hour, all the Hindus enter the water and duck under in it seven times".<sup>228</sup>

*Phālguna* (February-March):

Beginning from the eighth all the days of the dark-half of the month of Phālguna witnessed some kind of celebration. On the anniversary of the birth of Sītā on the eighth of the dark-half of the month of Phālguna, the Brāhmaṇas, friends and relatives were offered cakes.<sup>229</sup> Songs were arranged during the ninth, tenth and eleventh days of the above mentioned fortnight. People fasted on the thirteenth day and on the fourteenth worshipped Śaṅkara.<sup>230</sup> They kept awake the whole night and witnessed songs and dances and heard stories relating to Śiva. As Śaṅkara preached *ahimsā* so the Purāṇas advised that the animals were to be decorated. This day has been rightly called *Śivarātri* by Alberuni and Gardīzi.<sup>231</sup> The *Śivarātri* was a popular festival. In Kāśhmīr it was an important festival.<sup>232</sup> Kāśhmīr kings made presents on the occasion. Inscriptions of Rajputana and Madhya Pradesh also refer to it, but the month is stated to be in Māgha.<sup>233</sup>

In the bright-half, on the eighth day in commemoration of the creation of the earth by Keśava, the houses were illuminated with countless lamps. And the next day was spent in the midst of songs and dances and a grand feast.<sup>234</sup> In Kāśhmīr, according to the *Nilamata Purāṇa*<sup>235</sup> and the *Rāja-*

*tarāṅgiṇī*,<sup>236</sup> the festival on the eighth day was called *Mahīmāna*, when lamps were lit up on the snow in honour of the gods and *Pitris* and next day, a feast was given in which wine was also served. The eleventh and twelfth days were sacred to Viṣṇu and called *Nrisinghadvādaśī* by Chaṇḍeśvara,<sup>237</sup> *Govindadvādaśī* by Jīmūtavāhana,<sup>238</sup> and *Āmalakā-ekādaśī* by Hemachandra.<sup>239</sup> Bhoja in his *Rājamūrtanḍa*<sup>240</sup> tells us that the day is sacred to Hari. Hemachandra mentions another summer festival, called *Dola* in the *Dvyāśraya*<sup>241</sup> on the full moon-day of Phālguna. On this occasion, according to the commentator Abhayatilaka Gaṇi, children were kept securely in a room and were provided with sugarcandy and rice. But Bhoja informs us that on this date the car-festival of Skanda took place and coloured perfumes were thrown on the occasion.<sup>242</sup> Alberuni and Gardīzī call the festival on this day as *Odad* and *Dholā* (i.e. *Dola*) when "they make fire on places lower than those on which they make it on the festival *Camaha*, and they throw the fire out of the village".<sup>243</sup> But Gardīzī informs us that this festival was observed by women only.

Besides these, Lakṣmīdhara recommends that people should worship teachers, Agni, Brāhmanaś and the Creator on their own birth-day. Presents were to be given to the Brāhmanas of course.<sup>244</sup>

### *Conclusion :*

A perusal of the innumerable festivals mentioned by foreign writers like Alberuni and Gardīzī, the digest-makers like Jīmūtavāhana, Lakṣmīdhara, Bhoja, Śrīnāthāchārya and Chaṇḍeśvara and litterateurs like Kalhaṇa and Hemachandra and also the contemporary inscriptions, show that the busy months were Chaitra, Bhādra, Āsvin, Kārttika, Māgha and Phālguna. Most of the festivals synchronised with the harvesting of the autumn, winter and summer crops. Lesser number of holidays fell in the months of Jyaiṣṭha, Śrāvaṇa, Mārgaśīrṣa and Pauṣa. When there was a riot of Aśoka and Damanaka

flowers the God of Love was worshipped, and the swing festivals of Vāsudeva, Śiva and Gaurī, were held (vide *Aśokāṣṭamī*, *Damanakachaturdaśī* and *Swing festivals*). The *Dhūr Praśasti* calls the festival on the full moon-day of Chaitra as *Vasanto-sava*. When the fields lay full of the ripe corn it was a signal for holding the famous *Durgāpūjā*, *Kojāgara Pūrṇimā*, the *Dīvālī*, *Kāntāradīpadāna* and the *Kaumudīmahotsava*. The intimate connection of the rice-plants with the religious life of the Indian is described in the *Brahma Purāṇa* which has been quoted by Lakṣmīdhara and Chaṇḍeśvara.<sup>245</sup>

The observance of these festivities served many purposes. On the occasion of the full moon days of Āśvin and Kārtika, the houses were whitewashed and there was a regular clean-up. And on the occasion of the *Kāntāradīpadāna*, *Sukhasutikā*, *Kaumudīmahotsava* and the commemoration of the creation of the earth on the eighth phālguna *Śūkla*, lamps were lit up in all places. At present illumination is made only once a year on the Dīvālī night. Another purpose of festivals was to bring together all classes of people and make them join the celebrations. The car festivals served it excellently. *Durgā's ratha* was taken out on the ninth day of the dark fortnights of Bhādra and Āśvin. There were also processions of the cars of Mahādeva on the eighth of the bright-half of Pauṣa, of the Sun on the seventh of the bright-half of Māgha and of Puruṣottama at Puri on the full moon day of Jyaiṣṭha. If the car-festivals were optional, the attendance of all the citizens were obligatory on the days of the celebration of the *Kaumudīmahotsava*, on the full moon day in the month of Kārtika and the raising of Staff of Indra either in Bhādra or Āśvin.

Most of the festivals were celebrated by the young and old, men and women of all classes and creeds. Alberuni's comment that "most of the Hindu festivals are celebrated by women and children."<sup>246</sup> has to be accepted with reservation.

There was no dead uniformity in the observance of festivals in different parts of Northern India. For example, the full moon

day of Āśvin has been described as the *Kojāgarapūrṇimā* by Jīmūtavāhana.<sup>247</sup> Lakṣmi and Indra were worshipped in Bengal on that day. Chaṇḍeśvara clearly informs us that the practice of keeping awake at night was a Gauda custom.<sup>248</sup> But, according to Lakṣmīdhara, the fire god, Rudra (Śiva) Surabhī, Varuṇa, Vinūyaka and Revanta were worshipped in the full moon day of Āśvin. People abstained from food in the morning and spent the day in cleaning the streets and houses, and in songs and dances.<sup>249</sup> What was known as *Kaumudīmahotsava*, sacred to Rudra, was held, according to Lakṣmīdhara, on the full moon night of Kārtika.<sup>250</sup> Further, the *Daśaharā* festival was current only in Bengal and Malwa on the tenth day of the bright fortnight of Jyaiṣṭha.<sup>251</sup> Lakṣmīdhara also does not mention the custom of lighting lamps up in the skies (*ākāśapradīpadāna*) and especially on sixth, seventh or the *amāvasyā* in the month of Kārtika, which is prescribed by Bhoja and Jīmūtavāhana.<sup>252</sup> The *Bhātridīyā* was observed in Eastern India and Malwa. It is mentioned by Bhoja in his *Rājamārtanḍa* and Jīmūtavāhana in *Kālaviveka* and not by Lakṣmīdhara. The *Varachaturthī* and *Śrīpañchamī* are mentioned by Bhoja, Jīmūtavāhana and Chaṇḍeśvara but omitted by Lakṣmīdhara. Further Hemachandra in his *Deśināmamālā* refers to certain peculiar festivals which were not in vogue anywhere in North India except Gujrata-Mahārāṣṭra area in the twelfth century A.D. They are *Chorali*, *Cchapanti*,<sup>253</sup> *Navālaya*, *Paunam*,<sup>254</sup> *Pōlāo*,<sup>255</sup> *Bhāuam*,<sup>256</sup> *Layam*<sup>257</sup> and *Vahumas*.<sup>258</sup> Kamalabai Deshpande<sup>259</sup> has discussed the peculiarity of these festivals. The celebration of *Chorali* was observed by men, possibly by bachelors, who by worshipping Hara or Śiva got the type of bride they desired. "With the sprouts of *vilva* (aegle marmelos) you have worshipped Hara in sacred festival of *Chorali* in such a way that she will come to you, as if compelled by the arrows of cupid".<sup>260</sup> On the occasion of *Navālaya*, the married woman, while swinging did not give out the name of her husband. "That young bride is (said to be) observing the vow of *Navālaya*, who if at the

time of the game of a swing, is being asked the name of her husband, does not give it out and consequently is being beaten by her friends with *palāśa* twigs".<sup>261</sup> In the month of Āśvin, the husband ate a cake from the hands of his wife on the occasion of *Poḷao*. Unlike other law-givers and digest-makers, Hemachandra refers to the festival of Gaurī in the month of Āṣāḍha known as *Bhāuam*. The festivity of newly married couple, each calling the other by name was called *Layam*. Deshpande informs us that this custom is followed in modern Maharāṣṭra and Kārṇāṭaka. In other parts of India, however, it is forbidden to utter the name of one's husband.

A comparison of the festivals held during the period under review and modern India shows that the dates of some festivals have changed and new festivals have been introduced. The modern *Indrothāpana* festival is observed in Northern India and Mithila on the 12th Bhādra Śukla (Rudradhara: *Varṣakṛityam*, ed. R. C. Jha, Vol I. p. 71). But we have already seen that the flag of Indra was raised at different times in mediaeval Northern India. Again the car festival of Jagan-nātha starts in modern Eastern India on the second day of the bright-half of Āṣāḍha (Bengal calendar and *Varṣakṛityam* Vol. I. p. 71). But in the twelfth century A.D. it was observed on the full moon day of the month of Jyaiṣṭha. With regard to the swing festival of Kṛṣṇa, Alberuni and Gardizi observe that it was held on the eleventh day of the bright fortnight of Chaitra. This festival is not mentioned by any contemporary digest-maker of India. There cannot be any doubt that it was performed in mediaeval India. The *Hari-bhaktivilāsa*, composed in the sixteenth century A.D., quoting *Garuḍa Purāṇa*, states that in the midst of songs and dances, Kṛṣṇa or Hari should be placed on a swing, with his face towards the south on the 11th Chaitra Śukla (*Haribhaktivilāsa*, ch. 13, verse 99). Gopālabhaṭṭa further tells us that in Puri, the Dola festival is observed on the *Pratipada* or the full moon day of the month of Phālguna or on the asterism

*uttara Phalguṇī* entering the second stage (*Haribhaktivilāsa*, ch. 14, verse 103).

With regard to the Vaiṣṇava festivals, it may be pointed out here that, though the Gopī legend had been fully established by the end of our period, some of the festivities connected with the cult did not attain much popularity by the twelfth century A.D. Neither the digest-makers of our period nor the foreign Muslim writers refer to such festivals as the *Rāsa-pūrṇimā*, and the *dola* or *Holi* in the months of Kārttika and Phālguna respectively. It seems that these ceremonies became more popular from the thirteenth century A.D., because Śūlapāni flourishing in the latter-half of the fourteenth century, wrote books like *Dolayātrāviveka* and *Rāsayātrāviveka*.<sup>262</sup> The procession of the car of Kṛṣṇa and Puruṣottama did not exist even towards the end of the twelfth century. The *Haribhaktivilāsa* tells of a car festival of Kṛṣṇa on the bright fortnight of Kārttika, the day of *Prabodhinī Ekādaśī*.<sup>263</sup> Such a procession is not depicted by the contemporary writers of the twelfth century A.D. The *Snānāyātrā* of Jagannātha is also not mentioned in any book of the period under survey. Further, a fast and a festival connected with the *Rāmanavamī* was unknown at least till the first-half of the twelfth century A.D. In modern times it is observed on the ninth day of the bright fortnight of the month of Chaitra.<sup>264</sup> It must have been developed sometime in the latter-half of the twelfth century A.D.. This festival is mentioned in the *Chaturvargachintāmaṇi*<sup>265</sup> and the *Haribhaktivilāsa*.<sup>266</sup>

The following festive days of modern India were also not observed in the period under review. What we call now as *Vasanta-pañcamī* day or the *Sarasvatīpūjā*, which is celebrated on the fifth day of the bright-half of Māgha,<sup>267</sup> is conspicuous by its absence in mediaeval digests. The above-mentioned date, according to Bhoja and Jīmūtavāhana was sacred to Śrī or Lakṣmī and not to Sarasvatī.<sup>268</sup> Again, in Eastern India Śyāmā or Kālī is worshipped on the *Sukha-*

*rātri* day.<sup>269</sup> But this goddess was not worshipped on the above-mentioned date in the eleventh-twelfth centuries A.D., It was Lakṣmī and neither Śyāmā nor Kālī who was propitiated in his days of Jīmūtavāhana, Laṣmādhara and Chaṇḍeśvara. The *Chhat*, holy to the Sun, observed now-a-days in Bihar and also called *Pratihārīṣaṣṭhī* on the sixth day of the bright half of Kārttika<sup>270</sup> was not known to the North Indians up to the twelfth century. Even Chaṇḍeśvara of the fourteenth century A.D. Mithila does not speak of this particular date. During the period under review, the Sun was specially worshipped on the sixth and seventh day of the bright fortnight of the month of Chaitra,<sup>271</sup> fifth of Bhādra,<sup>272</sup> sixth of Pauṣa<sup>273</sup> and seventh day of Māgha-Śukla.<sup>274</sup> Similarly the worship of learning by the Kāyasthas of Bihar and the Uttar Pradesh observed on the *Bhrātridvītyā* day<sup>275</sup> was unknown to mediaeval India.

On the other hand, some festivals of the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. are not now observed in Northern India. Gaṇeśa is no longer worshipped on the eighth day of the dark-half of the month of Āṣāḍha.<sup>276</sup> Now-a-days, the *Gaṇeśa-chaturthī* is observed on the fourth day of the bright-half of Bhādra.<sup>277</sup> But this date, however, was held sacred to Śiva and Vighneśa or Gaṇeśa, by Jīmūtavāhana and Chaṇḍeśvara.<sup>278</sup> Jīmūtavāhana's recommendation that the day was sacred to Śiva or Pārvatī is identical with the observation of Bhoja. But Bhoja in his *Rājanvārtana* calls the day *Haritālikā*, sacred to Pārvatī alone.<sup>279</sup> All the ceremonies connected with *Kāntāradīpadāna* and the raising of the Flag Staff of Indra have fallen into disuse. The saturnalian festivals like the *Udakasevāmahotsava* and the *Śivarotsava* have also fortunately become obsolete.

The most remarkable feature of the life of the Hindus in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. is that at least 128 days out of 365 days in the year were spent in celebrating one festival or another in which gifts had to be made to the Brāhmaṇas and feasts had to be arranged for friends and



relatives. The larger the number of feasts, the greater was the income of the priestly class whose privilege it was to prescribe newer and newer festivals. Most of these festivals were celebrated with singing, dancing and merry-making. Living in the midst of perpetual fear and insecurity the people could find considerable relief in these celebrations from their nervous tension no doubt, but too many of them tended to generate a sense of frivolity in younger persons. When a festival distracted the attention of the people every third day, it was extremely difficult to ensure sustained interest in the more serious pursuits.

### REFERENCES TO CHAPTER XIII

#### (Festivals)

- 1 *Niyata*, pp. 377-382 ; *Kṛityaratnākara*, pp. 103-108.
- 2 *Niyata*, pp. 382-383 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 119. But according to modern Bengal calendar, the *Kārttikeyavrata* is held on the last day of *Kārttika*.
- 3 Sachau II. 176 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 121-123.
- 4 CC. Vol. II pt. I, Ch. 11, pp. 702-705.
- 5 *Rājamūrtanḍa* (ABORI Vol. 36 p. 333) ; KV p. 422 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 126-127.
- 6 CC. Vol. II. pt. 1, *Vratakhṇḍa* Ch. XII pp. 862-863.
- 7 *Niyata*, pp. 383-384 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 128.
- 8 Sachau II. 178.
- 9 Gardīzī MS p. 216 A
- 10 CC. Vol. II pt. 2, *Vratakhṇḍa*, Ch. 19, pp. 1194-98 ; *Kṛityaratnākara*, pp. 135-136.
- 11 *Niyata*, p. 384 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 128.
- 12 KV p. 470, CC. Vol. II. pt. 2, pp. 21-24 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 137-39.
- 13 *Modern Review*, March 1926 pp. 282-297—article on "The Origin of the Holi festival."
- 14 Gupte: *Hindu Holidays and Ceremonials* pp. 87-91 ; *Varṣakṛityam* Vol. I. p. 146.
- 15 *Niyata*, p. 384 ; KV P. 470 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 137-139.
- 16 *Dāyabhāga* (ed. Chandicharan Smṛitibhusana) p. 61, verse 32.
- 17 *Deśināmamālā* VI. 82.
- 18 Sachau II. 178.

- 19 Gapālabhaṭṭa: *Haribhaktivilāsa* Ch. 14, verse 100
- 20 *Ibid*, Ch. 14 verse 87, Cf. *Varṣakṛityam* Vol. I. p. 148 recommends observance of *Vasantotsava* on the first day of the dark half of the month of Chaitra.
- 21 Sachau II. 178-179.
- 22 *Niyata*. pp. 384-385 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 138-139.
- 23 *Niyata*. pp. 384 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 138.
- 24 Commentary to DV V. 141.
- 25 IA. XI. 338.
- 26 EI. VIII. 96.
- 27 KV p. 469.
- 28 CC. Vol. II pt. I, *Vratākhaṇḍa* Ch. XXI pp. 453-55 ; *Smṛitikaustubha* p. 19.
- 29 EI. XXIII. 134.
- 30 *Ibid* XXIII. 188.
- 31 *Niyata*. p. 443 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 532.
- 32 *Niyata*. p. 385 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 139.
- 33 *Niyata*. pp. 443-446 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 532-535.
- 34 *Niyata*. p. 444.
- 35 *Niyata*. p. 444 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 533-534.
- 36 *Niyata*. p. 446.
- 37 *Niyata* p. 446 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 535-536.
- 38 Sachau II. 178-179, Gardīzī Ms. p. 216 A. While Alberuni states 'Chaitra-Chashati ; Gardīzī writes *Chir-Jast*.'
- 39 *Niyata*. pp. 386-87 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 150-151.
- 40 *Niyata*. p. 387 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 154.
- 41 KV pp. 408-409 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 155-157.
- 42 *Tṛīsaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacharita* (Tr.), Vol I. p. 181.
- 43 DHNI II. 999 (Udaipur S. I. dated v. s. 1229/1173).
- 44 EI. XIV. 198 (Chandravati grant, dated v. s. 1156/1100 A.D.)
- 45 DHNI I. 516, 523 and 526.
- 46 Sachau II. 179 ; Gardīzī Ms. p. 216.
- 47 CC. Vol. II pt. I, *Vratākhaṇḍa* Ch. 7, pp. 450-452.
- 48 *Niyata*, p. 387, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 159.
- 49 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 157-159.
- 50 *Niyata*. p. 388 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 159-160.
- 51 *Niyata*. p. 388-389 ; KV p. 409 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 163-164.
- 52 Sachau II. 179 ; Gardīzī Ms. p. 216.
- 53 *Ibid*.
- 54 *Niyata*. pp. 389-390 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 186
- 55 *Niyata*. p. 390 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 190.
- 56 KV pp. 400-403, *Rājamūrtanḍa* (ABORI Vol. 36. 335-336) ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 187-88.
- 57 *Niyata* p. 387 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 159.
- 58 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 187-88.
- 59 Gupte: *Hindu Holidays and Ceremonials* p. 32 ; *Varṣakṛityam*, Vol. I. p. 170.

- 60 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 190-191.
- 61 Sachau II writes as Rūpa-pañcha and Gardīzī Ms. p. 216 as Rūpa-mañch.
- 62 *Rājāmārtaṇḍa* (ABORI, Vol. 36, 335); *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 192-95; CC II. pt. II *Vratākhaṇḍa* Ch. XXI pp. 272-274. Chaṇḍeśvara quotes *Rājāmārtaṇḍa* in *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 192.
- 63 *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 195.
- 64 Gupte: *Hindu Holidays and Ceremonials* p. 238.
- 65 *Brahma Purāṇa* Ch. 65. 58; *Skanda Purāṇa*, Utkalakhanda 32. 9; *Agni Purāṇa* Ch. 121. 63.
- 66 *Naiṣadhacharita*, Canto XV. 89.
- 67 *Rājāmārtaṇḍa* (ABORI, Vol. 36 p. 334; Jyātsthī tu Puruṣottama in verse 245).
- 68 *Niyata*. p. 390, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 198.
- 69 KV p. 471.
- 70 *Niyata*. pp. 390-391, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 199.
- 71 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 203-204.
- 72 *Ibid* pp. 445-446.
- 73 *Niyata*. pp. 391, KV pp. 175-185; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 204-205; *Rājāmārtaṇḍa* (ABORI Vol. 36 p. 314); Sachau II. 176.
- 74 *Niyata*. pp. 391-393; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 204-305. Chaṇḍeśvara quotes *Brahma* and *Varāha Purāṇas* in pp. 204-205 and *Vāmana Purāṇa* in pp. 206-207.
- 75 Sachau II. 176.
- 76 *Niyata*. pp. 393-94; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 218.
- 77 Sachau II 179; Gardīzī Ms. p. 217 A.
- 78 *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 203.
- 79 *Deśināmamālā* VI. 103.
- 80 Forbes: *Rūs Mālā* II. 319.
- 81 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 203-204.
- 82 CC. Vol II. pt. I, *Vratākhaṇḍa*, Ch. 13 p. 925.
- 83 *Niyata*. P. 395, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 251.
- 84 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 247-248; CC. Vol. II. pt. I, pp. 1037-1038.
- 85 *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 247.
- 86 Sachau II. pp. 176 and 179.
- 87 *Deśināmamālā* VII, 81.
- 88 EI. IX. 65-66.
- 89 Majumdar, A. K.; *Chaulukyas of Gujrat*, p. 308.
- 90 Sachau II. 181; Gardīzī Ms. p. 218A.
- 91 *Ibid*.
- 92 Sachau II. 177 and Cf. p. 176.
- 93 *Niyata*. pp. 395-396; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 257.
- 94 KV. 297.
- 95 *Rājāmārtaṇḍa* (ABORI Vol XXXVI pp. 320 and 322) verses 113-114 and 139. Some of the passages quoted by Bhoja are identical to *Kālaviveka* of Jīmūtavāhana, pp. 493-494.

- 96 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 259-264.
- 97 *Ibid* p. 261.
- 98 *Ibid* p. 262.
- 99 *Niyata*. p. 396 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 257.
- 100 Sachau II. 180, Gardīzi Ms. p. 217B.
- 101 Deśināmamālā VI. 127.
- 102 Majumdar, A. K. : *Op. Cit.* p. 308.
- 103 RT VIII 1007-1008. Stein identifies the lake as below the glaciers of Mt. Haramukūṭa.
- 104 Tod: *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* (ed. Crooke), Vol. I. Ch. XXI p. 548.
- 105 Kamauli pl. (DHNI I. 537).
- 106 KV p. 411.
- 107 ABORI Vol. XXXVI 323.
- 108 *Niyata*. pp. 396-97, KV pp. 413-14 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 272.
- 109 *Niyata*. p. 397 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 277.
- 110 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 278-279.
- 111 Sachau II. p. 177.
- 112 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 283-285.
- 113 Sachau II. pp. 180-181.
- 114 Gardīzi Ms. p. 217B.
- 115 Benares College grant dated v.s. 1232/1175 A.D. (DHNI I. 537).
- 116 *Rāj.* pp. 189-190.
- 117 *Bṛihatsaṃhitā* (Tr. N. C. Iyer) Ch. 43 pp. 23-26.
- 118 *Niyata*. p. 188 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 285.
- 119 KV. pp. 294-99.
- 120 *Ibid* p. 294.
- 121 *Rājamūrtanḍa* (ABORI Vol. XXXVI pp. 323-327).
- 122 *Rāj.* pp. 186.
- 123 DV. III. 8, Cf. also *Trīṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣaśharita* (Eng. Tr.) I. 343.
- 124 *Nīlamata Purāṇa* (ed. De Vreese) verses 738, 774-75 vide also De Vreese's comment in page 63 on verse 738.
- 125 RT. VIII. 170, 182 and 495
- 126 *Ibid* VIII 172, 174.
- 127 *Niyata* p. 397 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 285.
- 128 *Niyata*. pp. 401-402 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 286.
- 129 *Niyata*. pp. 397-401, KV pp. 414, 459-63 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 287-291.
- 130 *Niyata*. p. 399.
- 131 *Deśināmamālā* IV. 45.
- 132 *Niyata*. p. 398.
- 133 Sachau II. 180 ; Gardīzi Ms. p. 217B.
- 134 *Niyata*. p. 404 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 309.
- 135 *Niyata*. p. 404 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 309-310.
- 136 Sachau II. 180. But Gardīzi Ms. p. 217A puts the date as

sixteenth and calls it as Asoka or Aboi festival.

137 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 314-315. Chaṇḍeśvara also calls it as Navamirathavratam.

138 *Niyata*. pp. 404-406, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 348.

139 *Niyata*. pp. 406-407, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 347.

140 *Niyata*. pp. 407-408, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 350.

141 DV III. 6.

142 Sachau II. 179-190: "On the 8th Aśvāyuja when the moon stands in the nineteenth station, Mūlā, begins the sucking of the sugarcane. It is a festival holy to Mahānavamī, the sister of Mahādeva." ; Gardīzī MS. p. 217A.

143 KV. p. 514.

144 *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 362.

145 *Niyata* p. 410 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 373-375.

146 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 373-375.

147 *Niyata*. pp. 411-412 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 376-377.

148 *Niyata*. p. 411.

149 *Rājāmṛtaṇḍa* (ABORI Vol. XXXVI. 328) ; KV p. 403. Observed also in Mithila (Vide Rudradhara's *Varṣakṛityam* I. p. 99).

150 *Niyata*. pp. 452-456 ; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 379, 382-386.

151 *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 386.

152 *Niyata*. p. 456.

153 *Niyata*. p. 412-421, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 386-395.

154 *Niyata*. pp. 405-406, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 303-304.

155 *Bṛihatsaṃhitā* Ch. 34.

156 *Yuktikalpataru* (Cal. ed.) pp. 178-179.

157 *Rājāmṛtaṇḍa* (ABORI. Vol. XXXVI p. 328) verse 188.

158 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 333-334.

159 Sachau II. 180.

160 *Yuktikalpataru* p. 177.

161 *Deśinūmamālā* VI. 81.

162 *Niyata*. pp. 421-523, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 410-411.

163 ABORI XXXVI p. 329.

164 KV. pp. 403-404.

165 DV. II. verse 106.

166 *Deśinūmamālā* III. 43.

167 *Nilamata Purāṇa* (Lahore ed.) p. 42 verses 405-415, (ed. De Vreese, verses 398-406) *Skanda Purāṇa*, Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa Ch. 9ff ; *Padma Purāṇa*, Uttarakhaṇḍa Ch. 122 ; CC. *Kūlanirṇayakhaṇḍa* pp. 914-915 ; Nāgūnanda Act IV ; Vātsyāyana 1.4.43.

168 *Yasastilakachampū* (NS. Press pp. 597-99) Book III. verses 462-466.

169 Sachau II. 182.

170 Gardīzī Ms. p. 219A.

171 KV pp. 406-407 ; *Kṛityatattvārṇava* (HB I. 607).

172 *Niyata* p. 422, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 411.

- 173 DV III. 32.
- 174 ABORI Vol. XXXVI p. 329.
- 175 KV pp. 405-406.
- 176 *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 413.
- 177 CC Vol. II, pt. I pp. 382-386.
- 178 Śrīnāthāchārya in *Kṛityatattvārṇava* and Brihaspati Rāyamukuṭa in *Smṛitiratnāhāra* quoted in IHQ. XXVII p. 257.
- 179 Sachau II. 177.
- 180 ABORI Vol. XXXVI p. 315, *Niyata* p. 427, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 420 and 427.
- 181 *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 427.
- 182 *Niyata*, pp. 426-429, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 420-422 and 426-427.
- 183 IA. XVIII p. 83.
- 184 DV III verse 35.
- 185 *Niyata* pp. 425-426, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 413-414
- 186 *Niyata* pp. 429-431, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 423-425.
- 187 *Rāj.* pp. 182-183.
- 188 Sachau II. 182.
- 189 IA. XVIII, p. 83.
- 190 *Niyata* p. 431, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 452.
- 191 Sachau II. 186.
- 192 Sachau II. 182, Gardīzī Ms. p. 219A.
- 193 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 452-453.
- 194 CC. Vol. II pt. I. pp. 402-405.
- 195 *Niyata* p. 432, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 460-461.
- 196 KV p. 466 as *Vijayadvādaśī*, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 461-466 as *Ubhayadvādaśī* and *Matsyadvādaśī*.
- 197 *Niyata* pp. 433-434, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 471-472.
- 198 Sachau II. 183, Gardīzī Ms. p. 219A.
- 199 *Niyata* p. 434.
- 200 KV. p. 470.
- 201 *Niyata* p. 434, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 478-479.
- 202 Sachau II. 183.
- 203 *Niyata* p. 434
- 204 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 482-484.
- 205 Sachau II. 187.
- 206 *Ibid* II. 183 ; Gardīzī Ms. p. 219B.
- 207 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 480-482.
- 208 *Niyata* pp. 434-435, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 484-486.
- 209 *Niyata* p. 435, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 495.
- 210 *Niyata* pp. 435-436, Chaṇḍesvara in *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 495-96 calls it as *Tiladvādaśī*.
- 211 RT. V. 395.
- 212 IHQ. XXVII. 256.
- 213 Sachau II. 177 and 183 ; Gardīzī Ms. p. 219B.
- 214 Sachau II. 183.

- 215 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 498-500.  
 216 *Niyata* pp. 437-438; also in *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 503.  
 217 *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 504.  
 218 KV. p. 411.  
 219 ABORI XXXVI p. 331.  
 220 *Niyata* p. 438; Bhoja in *Rājamārtanḍa* (ABORI. XXXVI. p. 332) names it as Māghasaptami; Chaudesvara in *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 509 as *Jayantīsaptamī*; Jmūtavāhana in *Kūlaviveka* pp. 415-419 as *Jayantī* and *Rathasaptamī*.  
 221 KV. p. 418.  
 222 IA. XI. 112, Inscr. dated S. 675/753 A.D.  
 223 IA. XVII p. 140, inscr. dated KS 896/1145 A.D.  
 224 KV. p. 433; *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 510-512.  
 225 *Niyata* pp. 438-439, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 512-513.  
 226 Sachau II. 183.  
 227 Sachau II. 183. But Gardīzī Ms p. 220A puts the date as 27th and calls the festival as *Mansutak* and *Hamātān*.  
 228 Sachau II. 183.  
 229 *Niyata* p. 439; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 518.  
 230 *Niyata* p. 440, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 520-521.  
 231 Sachau II. 184; Gardīzī Ms. p. 220A. Both Alberuni and Gardīzī wrongly put the day as the day following the full-moon day in the month of *Phālguna*.  
 232 RT. I. 166, VIII 70 and 111  
 233 Sevadī SI. daed VS 1172/1115 A.D. (EI. XI. 31-32); Kiradu SI dated Vs. 1209/1153 A.D. (EI. XI. 45) and Chandrehe inscr. dated KS 724/c. 972 A.D. (EI. XXI. 150).  
 234 *Niyata* pp. 441-442, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 526-528.  
 235 *Nilamata Purāṇa* verses 515-517 (ed. de Vrcese)  
 236 RT VIII 2072.  
 237 *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 528-529.  
 238 KV p. 468.  
 239 DV XX. 5.  
 240 ABORI, Vol. XXXVI p. 333.  
 241 DV V. 141 Cf. Majumdar. A. K. *Chaulukyās of Gujarat* p. 306.  
 242 ABORI XXXVI p. 332, verses 227-228.  
 243 Sachau II pp. 183-184; Gardīzī Ms. p. 220A.  
 244 *Niyata* p. 447; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 540.  
 245 *Niyata* pp. 405-406, *Kṛityaratnākara* pp. 303-304.  
 246 Sachau II. 178.  
 247 KV p. 403.  
 248 *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 379.  
 249 *Niyata* pp. 411-412.  
 250 *Rāj.* pp. 182-183.  
 251 KV. pp. 400-403; *Rājamārtanḍa* (ABORI, XXXVI p. 335).  
 252 KV. p. 325. In his *Rājamārtanḍa*, Bhoja (ABORI XXXVI

p. 330) recommends the giving of lamps to skies throughout the month of Kārttika.

253 *Deśināmamālā* III. 25.

254 *Ibid* III. 25.

255 *Ibid* VII. 16.

256 *Ibid* VI. 103.

257 *Ibid* VII. 16.

258 *Ibid* VII 46.

259 ABORI XXXVI (1945) pp. 340-351.

260 *Deśināmamālā* III. 19.

261 *Ibid* IV. 21.

262 Hazra, R. C.: *Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs* pp. 322, 325 and 326.

263 *Haribhaktivilāsa* Ch. 16, verses 176-198.

264 Rudradhara: *Varṣakṛityam* Vol. I. pp. 151-159.

265 CC. Vol. pt. I *Vratākhaṇḍa* Ch. 13 pp. 941-946.

266 *Haribhaktivilāsa* Ch. 14 verses 60ff.

267 *Varṣakṛityam* Vol. I. p. 133.

268 KV 412, ABORI Vol. XXXVI p. 331.

269 *Varṣakṛityam* Vol. I p. 107 and Bengali calendars.

270 *Ibid* I. p. 115.

271 Sachau II 176, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 121

272 Sachau II. 177.

273 *Ibid.* II. 177.

274 *Niyata* p. 438, KV pp. 418-419; *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 509.

275 *Varṣakṛityam* I. p. 112.

276 *Niyata.* p. 390, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 198.

277 Gupte: *Hindu Holidays and Ceremonials* pp. 54, 55 and 67.

278 KV pp. 411-412, *Kṛityaratnākara* p. 271.

279 ABORI Vol. XXXVI p. 323, verses 141-144.



## CHAPTER XIV.

### **Tirthas or Places of Pilgrimage.**

*Tirthas* played an important role in the cultural and economic life of mediaeval India. These were situated usually in the most beautiful places like hilltops, mountains, forests, confluence of rivers, or in the vicinity of the sea, waterfalls and hot water springs. Such places were conducive to meditation and as such attracted those who had a yearning for spiritual life. While ascetics and anchorites practised religious austerities in the *Tirthas*, pious householders considered it incumbent upon them to pay a visit to some of these important holy places at least once in their life.

Congregation of men and women speaking different languages and dialects, wearing separate sectarian marks, donning various types of dresses and observing different manners and customs in these *Tirthas* widened the outlook of the pilgrims, ironed out differences, served as a solvent for all exclusiveness and narrow parochialism and helped every one to feel the essential unity in Indian culture. The *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra*<sup>1</sup> in stating the length and breadth of India in terms of *Tirthas* says that from Badarikā to Rāmeśvara is a distance of 1000 *Yojanas* and from *Dvārakā* as far as Puruṣottama and the Śālagrāma is a matter of 700 *Yojanas*. Exchange of ideas and learned discussions among the scholarly people, coming from different parts of the country, helped to diffuse news about the latest writings by poets, scholars and philosophers. The urge for the construction of magnificent temples and for the installation of beautiful images in these holy places educated public taste and promoted artistic activities. Many of the important places of pilgrimage, seats of learning that they were, became notable centres of trade and industry too. While the masses were eager to bring back to their homes some memento of their visit to a *tirtha*, artists and artisans

combined to produce different types of art objects at different places. Some industries thus became localised in many of the *tirthas*. New *tirthas* came into existence with the rise of new sects and cults, while it was not unusual for an old *tirtha* to fall into oblivion on account of political or economic reasons.

One of the oldest accounts of *tirthas* is to be found in the Vanaparva of the *Mahābhārata*. The Purāṇas recount the names and glories of many of the *tirthas*, but it is difficult to date definitely different portions of even the same Purāṇa. We are fortunate, however, in having not only reference to *tirthas* in contemporary inscriptions, but also more or less elaborate accounts in works which are known to have been written in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D.. From a critical study of these sources we may learn which of the *tirthas* were prominent in this period and also which had fallen into comparative obscurity or which had not yet attained celebrity.

The Charkhari plate of Devavarmadeva dated V.S. 1108/ 1051 A.D. states that the Chandella King Devavarmadeva, grandson of Vidyādhara-deva bathed at Koṭitīrtha on a full moon day, worshipped Śūlapāṇi (Śiva) and granted a village on the bank of the river Yamunā to a Brāhmaṇa.<sup>2</sup> Kane shows<sup>3</sup> that there are as many as ten Koṭitīrthas, but there is only one on the bank of the Ymaunā near Mathurā, referred to in the *Varāha Purāṇa*.<sup>4</sup> In 1055 A.D. we find Jayasinha of Dhara granting a village for the support of the Brāhmaṇas of the holy Amareśvara.<sup>5</sup> There are three *tirthas*, bearing the name Amareśvara, but as the Mandhata plate of Jayasinha, which contains the above information has been found near the river Narmadā, this particular Amareśvara must be on the opposite side of Omkārnātha on the southern bank of Narmadā. Lakṣmīdhara writing in the early years of the twelfth century has failed to notice either Amareśvara or Ekāmra, now known as Bhuvanesvara. The Brāhmeśvara temple inscription of the 18th regnal year of King Uddyotake-

sarī (c. 1055-1080 A.D.) refers to the erection of the "cloud-touching temple with four Cāruśālā temples" at Siddhatīrtha in Ekāmra.<sup>6</sup> This is a positive evidence of the claim of Bhuvaneśvara for recognition as a holy place in the middle of the eleventh century. An inscription of the Chālukya King Vikramāditya VI of the year 1082 A.D. makes a specific reference to the holy places of Vārāṇasī, Kurukṣetra, Arghyatīrtha, Prayāga and Gayā. Though Arghyatīrtha has been mentioned also in the Goharwa plate of the Kalachuri King Karṇa, dated 1047 A.D., as a place on the bank of the Ganges, yet it cannot be properly identified. The four other *tīrthas* are well-known for their sanctity. The Chandrāvati plate shows the importance of Ayodhyā as a *tīrtha* in 1093 A.D. The Gāhaḍavāla King Chandradeva states in this inscription that he bathed at the Svarga-dvāratīrtha at the sin-effacing confluence of Sarayū and Ghargharā rivers at Ayodhya, also called Uttara-Kośala on the occasion of the solar eclipse in the month of Āśvina, 23rd October, 1093 A.D.<sup>7</sup> Madanapāla in an inscription dated 1107 A.D.<sup>8</sup> and Jayachandra in his Benares copper plate grant of 1175 A.D. claim that Chandradeva protected the holy places of Kāśī, Kuśika, Uttarakośala and Indrasthāna.<sup>9</sup> Kuśika may be identified with Kuśapura or Kuśabhavanapura (modern Sultanpur on the Gomati in Oudh) the capital of Kuśa, son of Rāmachandra. Indrasthāna can not be the same as Indraprastha or Delhi and it has not yet been possible to identify it correctly. This shows how some of the *tīrthas* have fallen into oblivion in course of time. Protection of holy places became a special necessity in this age on account of occasional raids by Turks and also by gangs of robbers who infested the roads. Someśvara in his *Kīrtikaumudī*<sup>10</sup> describing the pilgrimage of Vastupāla states that bands of marauders were more numerous than peaceful travellers.

Another important *tīrtha* mentioned in an inscription dated Śaka 1059/1137-38 A.D. is Purusottama. The Bihar poet Gaṅgādhara, hailing from Govindapura, in the Nawadah subdivision of the Gaya district, states that his father Manoratha

visited Purī.<sup>11</sup> This information is highly important in view of the fact that the Vanaparva of the *Mahābhārata*, *Dānasāgara* of Vallālasena and the *Tīrtha-vivechanakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara do not mention Purī, Puruṣottama or Jagannātha at all. We can now state with confidence that though Purī had not attained an all-India celebrity in the 5th Century A.D., yet in the beginning of the twelfth century, it had begun to attract pilgrims from distant Bihar. This evidence is corroborated by the *Kālaviveka* of Jīmūtavāhana, where it is stated that the full moon day in the month of Jyaiṣṭhya at Puruṣottama is especially meritorious.<sup>12</sup>

The Jabbalpore stone-inscription dated 1174 A.D. informs us that Vimalaśiva, a Śaiva teacher enjoying the patronage of the Kalachuri Kings, performed religious rites at Prabhāsa, Gokarna, Gayā and other *tīrthas*.<sup>13</sup> The *Cintra Praśasti* of the reign of Śaraṅgadeva dated 1287 A.D. gives an account of the pilgrimage of a Śaiva ascetic, Tripurāntaka, who worshipped Śiva at Kedāra, and at the confluence of Gaṅgā and Yamunā at Prayāga, circumambulated Śrīparvata and saw God Mallinātha, bathed in the waters of rivers Revā and Godāvarī, visited Tryambaka, reached Rāmeśvara, and then visiting Prabhāsa returned by way of Devapattana.<sup>14</sup>

It is interesting to note in this connection that the *Śiva Purāṇa*<sup>15</sup> gives a list of the twelve Jyotirlingas as follows:—(1) Somanātha (2) Mallikārijuna on Śrīśaila hill (3) Mahākāla at Ujjaini (4) Omkāra at Amareśvara (5) Kedāra (6) Bhīmaśamkara in Dākinī (northwest of Poona) (7) Viśveśvara at Kāśī (8) Tryambaka at Gautamītaṭa near Nasik (9) Vaidyanātha at Chitābhūmi which is probably identical with Deoghar-Baidyanathadham in the Santhal Parganas (10) Nāgeśa at Dārūkavana which may be near Dvārakā or Ayodhyā in the former Hyderabad State (11) Rāmeśvara and (12) Ghrīṣneśa at Śivālaya in the village Elura near Daulatābād. Taking Prabhāsa to be identical with Somanātha, only the first, second, fifth, eighth, and the eleventh Jyotirlingas in the above list were visited by the ascetic Tripurāntaka. It is surprising to

find that Viśveśvara at Kāśi was omitted from his itinerary. Lakṣmīdhara mentions Viśveśvara as one of the 220 Liṅgas of Vārāṇasī<sup>16</sup> and also included Ujjainī and Kedāra. He is absolutely silent about Somanātha, Śrīsaila, Bhīmaśaṁkara, Tryambaka, Vaidyanātha, Rāmeśvara and Ghrīṣṇeśa. Vallālasena in his *Dānasāgara* mentions Śrīparvata, Avantikā which may be identical with Ujjain, Oṁkāra, Kedāra, Vārāṇasī and Rāmeśvara but is silent about other seven Jyotirlingas. The *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra* mentions eight famous Śivakṣetras, but none of the twelve Jyotirlingas except the name of Avimukta occurs in the list. In the Kedārakhaṇḍa of the *Skanda Purāṇa*<sup>17</sup> we find the following:—(1) Oṁkāra and (2) Mahākāla on the bank of Narmadā, (3) Viśveśara at Kāśī, (4) Laliteśvara at Prayāga, (5) Tryambaka at Brahmāchala, (6) Bhadrēśvara at Kālī, (7) Drākṣārāmeśvara at Gaṅgā Sāgara-Saṅgama, (7) Someśvara in Saurāṣṭra, (9) Sarveśvara at Vindhyāchala, (10) Śikhareśvara at Śrīsaila, (11) Allalanātha at Kantipur and (12) Siṁhanātha in Siṁhala. In view of all these we may conclude that there is no positive proof of recognition of the twelve Jyotirlingas before the thirteenth century.

Amongst the literary sources of information on the *tirthas* of this period, Alberuni mentions Multan,<sup>18</sup> Thāneśvar, temple of Śāradā in Kashmir,<sup>19</sup> Banaras,<sup>20</sup> Puṣkar, Mathura<sup>21</sup> and Kashmir.<sup>22</sup> The *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva, who flourished in the eleventh century mentions Badari,<sup>23</sup> Durgā dwelling in the Vindhya hills,<sup>24</sup> Puṣkara,<sup>25</sup> Prayāga,<sup>26</sup> Banaras<sup>27</sup> and Chitrakūṭa.<sup>28</sup>

The most important work on the *tirthas*, however, is the eighth volume of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* entitled the *Tīrthavivechanakāṇḍam* by Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara, the Chief Minister for Peace and War of the Gāhaḍavāla King Govindachandra. The writer was the son of Bhaṭṭa Hṛdayadhara, who also held the office of Mahā-sandhī-vigrahika. Lakṣmīdhara began the compilation of this work in the early part of the reign of Govindachandra, probably in 1110 A.D. according to K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.<sup>29</sup> Kane assigns the work to the period bet-

ween 1110 and 1130 A.D.<sup>30</sup> Lakṣmīdhara describes here at great length the sanctity of Vārāṇasī. Out of 260 pages, 135 are devoted to the description of nearly 340 shrines of Vārāṇasī alone. The holiness of Prayāga is described in 17 pages, of Gayā in 12 pages, of Mathurā in 9 pages, of Kurukṣetra in 5 pages, of Puṣkara and Śrīkara in 4 pages each, of Ujjainī, Hardwar, Śālagrāma, Stutasvāmī, Dvārakā and Kedāra in 3 pages each, of Kokāmukha, Prithūdaka, Mandāra and Lohārgala in two pages each. Naimiṣa gets one page. The rest of the 24 pages describe 57 other *tīrthas*. The book ends with a 7-page account of the Mahāpathayātrā or "the great road" to death.

It is worthy of note that Lakṣmīdhara omits some of the most important *tīrthas* like Puruṣottama, Ekāmra or Bhuvanesvara, Koṇāraka, Kāñchī, Chidambaram, Śrīraṅgam, Rāmeśvara, Kanyākumārī and Jalandhara.

We get some idea of the important *tīrthas* from the *Kālaviveka* of Jīmūtavāhana, who flourished in Bengal in the first half of the twelfth century A.D.. In the introduction to the Bibliotheca Indica edition of *Kālaviveka*, it is stated that as Jīmūtavāhana mentions certain astronomical observations of 1013 and 1015 of the Śaka era without referring to any authority and simply saying "Driṣṭam" or seen, he may be presumed to have seen these himself. In that case he must have written this work in c. 1091-1093 A.D. He writes that a dip at Puṣkara in the month of Māgha, on the eighth day of the dark half of the month of Māgha at Gayā, in the month of Pauṣa on the same *tithi* in Narmadā, on the fourteenth day of Chaitra at Śālagrāma, at Puṇḍarika on the tenth day of the bright half of the month, at Prabhāsa and Taijasa on the succeeding *amāvasyā* or new moon day, in the Yamunā on the Kṛṣṇa Chaturdaśī in the month of Māgha, in Beas on the thirteenth day of the bright half of the month of Pauṣa, on the same *tithi* in the months of Māgha and Pauṣa in the Chandrabhāgā, frees a person from all sins.<sup>31</sup> Writing about the full moon day, he states that it is highly meritorious to observe it

at Prayāga in the month of Māgha, at Naimiṣāraṇya in Phāl-guna, at Śālagrāma in Chaitra, at Gaṅgādvāra in Vaiśākha, at Puruṣottama in Jyaiṣṭha, at Kanakhala in Āṣāḍha, at Kedāra in Srāvaṇa, at Badarī in Bhādra, at Kubjāgra (north of Hriṣīkeśa) in Āśvin, at Puṣkara in Kārttika, at Kubja in Agrahāyaṇa and at Ayodhyā in Pauṣa.<sup>32</sup> Kubjaka is referred to in the *Bṛhannāradiya Purāṇa*<sup>33</sup> and *Garuḍa Purāṇa*<sup>34</sup> as the seat of the sanctuary of Śrīdhara Hari. But it cannot be identified with certainty. Nundolal De mentions Kubja as a tributary of Narmadā. One peculiar feature of this list is that no southern holy place has been mentioned here. Another remarkable thing is that of the 12 places as many as five namely, Gaṅgādvāra or Hardwara, Kanakhala, Kedāra, Badarī and Kubjāgra are situated in the Himalayan region. These holy places draw a large number of pilgrims even on the occasions mentioned by Jimūtavāhana.

The *Dānasāgara*, composed in 1169 A.D. and ascribed to Vallālasena but probably written by his preceptor Aniruddha, devotes a section to *Puṇyadeśah* or holy places where gifts are specially efficacious.<sup>35</sup> The sanctity of 27 rivers is mentioned in prose without quoting any authority. Of these 15 are mentioned also by Lakṣmīdhara. These are Narmadā, Yamunā, Gaṅgā, Gaṅgāsāgarasaṅgama, Mahā Gaṅgā, Saraswatī, Kauśikī, Sarayū, Godāvarī, Vipāśā, Śatadru, Chandrabhāgā, Vitastā, Kāverī and Varunā. Other rivers namely Śoṇa-Jyotirasyāsaṅgama, Irāvati, Tāptī, Śūlatāpī, and Veṇvā have been omitted by Lakṣmīdhara, though their sanctity has been mentioned in the *Agni Purāṇa*, other Paurāṇic works and *Dānasāgara*. As many as ninetyfive places are mentioned as specially suitable for making gifts and performing Śrāddha. Of these 27 have also been mentioned by Lakṣmīdhara. These are: (1) Aśvatīrtha (probably at the confluence of Ganges and Kālīnadī near Kanauj, though there are two other places of the same name, one on the Godāvarī and the other on the Narmadā), (2) Aṅgāravāhika (not identified), (3) Avantikā, (4) Amarakaṇṭaka (a mountain in the Bilaspur district of Madhya Pradesh), (5) Agastyāśrama

(six places of this name are mentioned by Kane and eight places by De), (6) Uttaiamānasa (in Kasmira), (7) Oṃkāra (32 miles north-west of Khandwa), (8) Kanakhal (near Hardwar), (9) Kūlikāśrama, (10) Kālodaka (in Kasmira or on Mt. Haramukūṭa at 1300 feet above sea level), (11) Kurukṣetra (Thaneswar), (12) Kedāra (on the Himalayas), (13) Gayā, (14) Govardhana (near Mathura), (15) Nīla (mountain near Hardwara), (16) Naimiṣāraṇya (45 miles from Lucknow), (17) Piṇḍāraka (in Khambhalia Mahal of Kathiawar), (18) Prayāga, (19) Prabhāsa (Verwal, Somanatha), (20) Pṛithūdaka (modern Pehoa in the Karnal district on the southern bank of Sarasvatī), (21) Phalgutīrtha (Gayā), (22) Vārāṇasī, (23) Viṣṇupāda (Gayā), (24) Badari (Badrinārāyaṇa), (25) Bhṛigutuṅga (there are five *tīrthas* bearing this name), (26) Raivataka (Junagadh), (27) Hariśchandra (under Vārāṇasī).

The remaining 68 *tīrthas* not mentioned by Lakṣmīdhara deserve special mention as indicating places, which were considered sufficiently important by Vallālasena, who relied mostly on the authority of the *Matsya Purāṇa*. As many as 35 of these, however, have now fallen into such obscurity that learned scholars like Kane or Nundo Lal De have not been able to identify them. These are (1) Aṭṭahāsa (it is highly improbable that this place is the same as the Śākta Pīṭha near Lābhpur in the Birbhum district of West Bengal, because Vallālasena was hostile to the Tāntrik cult. The *tīrtha* of the same name which has been described in the *Matsya Purāṇa*<sup>36</sup> is sacred to the Pitṛs cannot be identified) (2) Aṅgabhūta, (3) Kapilodaka, (4) Kadalirwa, (5) Kārū, (6) Kuchajāgra, (7) Ghaṇṭeśvara, (8) Delāpura, (9) Pitṛitīrtha, (10) Pampātīrtha, (11) Pāṭāla, (12) Priyamelaka, (13) Vasiṣṭhatīrtha, (14) Visuka, (15) Vaināyaka, (16) Vilvaka, (17) Bhadrakāleśvara, (18) Mahānada, (19) Mahālaya, (20) Mahāśālā, (21) Mahārudra, (22) Mahāliṅga, (23) Matsyanadī, (24) Śatarudra, (25) Śatāhva, (26) Śivadhara, (27) Śaṅkhodhara, (28) Śrīparṇa, (29) Śrīpati, (30) Sugandhā, (31) Svargamārgapradeśa, (32) Sahasrākṣa, (33) Hutāśana (34) Hiranyākṣa, and (35) Harīta.



Amongst some of the well-known *tirthas* omitted by Lakṣmidhara but included by Vallālasena are Rāmeśvara, Kāyāvarohana, where Nakulī or Lakulī, the founder of the Pāsupata sect flourished in the second century A.D. and identified with Karvan, 15 miles south of Baroda, rivers Gharghara and Daśārṇa, Varāhaparvata in Kashmir, Indrakīla beyond Gandhamādāna in the Himalayas and Śākambharī or Sambhar Lake, which is also referred to in an inscription of Vighraharāja dated 973-974 A.D. One of the *tirthas*, sacred to the Pitṛs mentioned in the *Dānasāgara* is Mahābodhi. As it is the same as the famous Bodhi tree at Bodh Gayā, it is an evidence of rapprochement between the Hindus and the Buddhists.

Another contemporary source of information regarding the *tirthas* is the *Māṇṣollāsa*, written by Someśvara Chālukya of Kalyāṇa. It mentions Jāhnavī, Yamunā, Narmadā, Tāptī, Gautamī or Godāvarī, Sarasvatī, Bañjarā, Bhīmarathī or Bhīmā, Kṛṣṇā, Vṛhannadī (Mahānadī), Malāpahārīṇī (Malaprabha) as the sacred rivers. The other *tirthas* mentioned in it are Puṣkara, Śuklatīrtha, situated at a distance of ten miles north-east of Broach, Prabhāsa, Kedāra, Prayāga and Vārāṇasī.<sup>37</sup>

Hemachandra, the famous Jaina scholar of the twelfth century mentions the following *tirthas* in his *Dvyāśrayakāvya*: Somanātha and Śaṅkhodhara in Sorath,<sup>38</sup> Śuklatīrtha on the Narmadā near Broach,<sup>36</sup> Ujjainī on the bank of Śiprā "where there are Devasthānas and places of pilgrimage called after the Rṣis<sup>40</sup>" and Mount Abu, which contained the hermitage of the sage Vaśiṣṭha, river Mandākinī, the temples of Achaleśvara Mahādeva, Rīṣabhadeva, Sindhuka and other Devīs.<sup>41</sup>

The *Bārhaspatya Arthasāstra*, edited by Thomas, gives the names of eight *tirthas* each of the Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva and Śākta sects (III. 119-126). It also mentions Kumāra sacred to Kārttikeya, Sahya to Gaṇeśa, Raivataka to Teacher and Pāriyātra, western part of Vindhya, sacred to Kṣetrapāla. As this work mentions the Yādavas of Devagiri, it cannot be earlier than the twelfth century. Thomas, however, thinks

that the *tirtha* section<sup>42</sup> may be an interpolation. The division of the Hindus into these sects was well-marked in the twelfth century and separate *Purāṇas* had been compiled for different sects by that time. There is, therefore, no valid reason to suspect that the *tirtha* portion was added later. The Vaiṣṇava *tirthas* are Badarikā, Śālagrāma, Puruṣottama, Dvārakā, Vilvāchala, Ananta, Sīmha and Śrīraṅgam. Of these Lakṣmīdhara mentions Badarikā, Śālagrāma and Dvārakā only. We have already referred to the inscriptional evidence of the sanctity of Puruṣottama in 1137 A.D.. Vilvāchala cannot be identified. Ananta may be Anantatīrtha under Mathurā, referred to in the *Varāha Purāṇa*<sup>43</sup> or Anantaśayana Padmanābha in Trivandrum described in the *Padma Purāṇa*.<sup>44</sup> Sīmha may be identified with Simhāchalam, 6 miles to the north-west of Visakhapattam. Śrīraṅga is the well-known *tirtha* on the Kāverī, 2 miles to the north of Trichinopoly. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*,<sup>45</sup> *Matsya Purāṇa*<sup>46</sup> and *Padma Purāṇa*<sup>47</sup> mention it as a holy place. Of the eight Śaiva *tirthas*, Avimukta and Gaṅgādvāra only are well-known. The other six *tirthas*, namely Śivakṣetra, Rāmāyāmūnā, Śivasarasvatī, Mavya, Śārdūla, and Gajākṣetra cannot be identified. The very fact that the Jyotirlingas of the *Śiva Purāṇa* are not mentioned here supports the view that this section is not an interpolation. The Śākta *tirthas* are Oghghīnajāla, Pūrṇā, Kāma, Kolla, Śrīśaila, Kāñchī and Mahendra. Of these, the first cannot be identified. Pūrṇā is the same as Pūrṇapīṭha or Pūrṇaśaila of the *Kālikā Purāṇa* (64.43) and Pūrṇagiri of *Sādhnamālā* (p. 453). Dr. D. C. Sircar suggests that it may be the same as the shrine of Bhavānī at Tuljapur to the south of Osmanabad in the Bijapur region.<sup>48</sup> Kanyā is Kāmākhya. Kolla is Kolhapur where there is the famous temple of Mahālakṣmī.<sup>49</sup> Śrīśaila is Śrīparvata in the Karnal District, 50 miles from the Kṛṣṇā station, which has got Mollikārjuna as the Mahādeva and Mādhavī as the Devī. Kāñchī is Conjeeveram in the Chingleput District of Madras. Mahendra is the famous hill of the Ganjam district. *Barhaspatya Arthaśāstra* mentions

probably as the eighth *tīrtha*, the Vindhya, as the eternal abode of Durgā Bhadrakālī.

A manuscript entitled *Pramāṇapallava* by Narasiṃha and found in Mithila gives an account of several *tīrthas*. This work was compiled later than Lakṣmīdhara, as it quotes from his *Kṛityakalpataru*, but it is quoted by Chanḍeśvara who flourished between 1300 and 1370 A.D. *Pramāṇapallava*, therefore, could not have been composed later than the thirteenth and earlier than the twelfth century A.D.. The *tīrthas* discussed in this work are: Prayāga, Gaṅgā, Kāśī, Gayā, Puruṣottama, Koṇārka, Narmadā, Mathurā, Yamunā, Dvādaśavana, Puṣkara, Tāpī, Dhāreśvara, Ayodhyā, Dvārakā, and Godāvarī. Dvādaśavana is in the Mathurā region. Dhāreśvara may be identified with the Dhārātīrtha referred to in *Matsya Purāṇa*<sup>51</sup> on the north bank of the Narmadā. The other places are well-known.

Besides these we get some stray references to some *tīrthas* in some inscriptions and poetical or historical works of this period. Thus the image-inscription of Nāyaka Pratāpadhavala, found at Tilothu in the Shahabad district of Bihar, records the Mahānāyaka's pilgrimage to the Tutrahi falls in the company of his sons, Śatrughna, Vīradhavala and Sāhasadhavala; his brother's wife Sulhi and of other members of his family like Tribhuvanadhavala Sonali, Lakṣmaditya and Padmaditya. Five female slaves also accompanied this party. These must have been great favourites; otherwise their names (Ladumā, Nayakāmā, Alhi, Puttriki and Ekalī) would not have been inscribed on the stone image.<sup>52</sup> Other inscriptions of Pratāpadhavala bearing dates corresponding to 1158 and 1169 A.D. have been found in Shahabad district. Tutrahi or Tilothu has fallen into oblivion as a place of pilgrimage now. An inscription of 1164 A.D. records the visit of a Kāyastha pilgrim to Viśālapura in the former Jaipur state in Rajputana.<sup>53</sup> Another inscription of 1167 A.D. bears testimony to the visit of certain pilgrims to Rāmgadh in Kotah, Rajputana.<sup>54</sup> The Sihawa stone-inscription of Karṇarāja dated

1192 A.D. shows that Karṇarāja, ruler of a portion of Raipur district in Madhya Pradesh, erected five magnificent buildings in the *tīrtha* Devahrada for the installation of images of five deities. This Devahrada cannot be either Gaṇḍakī as described in the *Varāha Purāṇa*<sup>55</sup> or under Kṛṣṇa-Veṇva referred to in the Vanaparva.<sup>56</sup> The Paldī inscription of Guhila Arisimha dated 1116 A.D.<sup>57</sup> refers to Bhṛīgukachacha or Broach as a place of pilgrimage, especially for the Nakuliśa Pāśupata sect.

An interesting reference to a place of pilgrimage in Varendrī, now in East Pakistan, occurs in the *Rāmacharita* of Sandhyākaranandī.<sup>58</sup> Speaking of Varendrī, it states: "which, with the glorious streams of Gaṅgā and Karatoyā flowing on either side, was the holiest place and which was pure and spotless on account of its having the great place of pilgrimage (or landing *ghāṭa*) called Apunarbhava in its very heart".<sup>59</sup> It is not possible now to identify this place. Another Bengal *tīrtha*, now completely forgotten, has been referred to by Kṛṣṇamiśra in his *Prabodhachandrodaya*, written in the reign of the Chandella King Kirttivarman, towards the end of the eleventh century. This is Chakratīrtha on the bank of Bhāgīrathī in Rāḍha, where Viveka is described as practising austerities (Act IV). In Act II of this allegorical drama, we find Śraddhā, one of the associates of Viṣṇubhakti with her daughter Śānti as working at Puruṣottama. *Naiṣadha-charita* of Śrīharṣa, son of Śrī Hīra, who probably flourished under Vijayachandra and Jayachandra of Kanauj in the latter half of the twelfth century,<sup>60</sup> refers to Vṛndāvana dense with fragrant flower and to Govardhana, where from "all serpents are banished by the strutting of flocks of peacocks".<sup>61</sup> Kāśī has been described as "Śiva's boat of piety for traversing the span of worldly existence".<sup>62</sup> Another verse refers to the *Śrāddha* ceremony at Gayā.

Kalhaṇa in his *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* refers to three *tīrthas* of all-India fame outside Kashmir. These are Vārāṇasī,<sup>64</sup> Prayāga<sup>65</sup> and Gayā.<sup>66</sup> He records with evident pride that

Kashmir "which Keśava and Īśāna adorn as Chakrabhrit and Vijayeśa as well as in other (forms), there is not a space as large as a grain of sesamum without a *tīrtha*".<sup>67</sup> This seems to be an echo of the Vanaparva<sup>68</sup> which states that the whole country of Kashmir is holy. Lakṣmīdhara recognised this claim by quoting the Anuśāsanaparva in his *Tīrthavivechana-kāṇḍa*.<sup>69</sup> It is stated here that a man taking his bath in Śatadru, Chandrabhāgā, Vitastā and Ormimālini becomes a sage-like person and when a man of character bathes or worships the river Sindhu and the great rivers into which fall the smaller rivers of the Kashmir region, he goes to heaven. Alberuni heard of Hindus visiting Kashmir.<sup>70</sup>

Lakṣmīdhara<sup>71</sup> and Vallālasena<sup>72</sup> refer to Kālodaka and Uttaramānasa in Kashmir as places of great sanctity. Vallālasena considers these places as eminently suited for *śrāddha* and making gifts. Kālodaka is referred to in the *Anuśāsanaparva*,<sup>73</sup> *Viṣṇudharmasūtra*,<sup>74</sup> the *Kashmirian Purāṇa*, *Nīlamata*, written probably in the sixth century A.D. and *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.<sup>75</sup> It is now known as Mudkol and is situated at an altitude of about 13,000 ft. Thousands of pilgrims visit it even today in the month of Bhādra on their way to Uttaramānasa or Gaṅgā lake, which lies at a short distance above it. The high alpine valley at the foot of the east glaciers of the 17,000 feet high Haramukūṭa containing Kālodaka is called Nandīkṣetra in the *Nīlamata*.<sup>76</sup> It is related here that Nandī performed in the Kālodaka a great penance, whereupon Śiva granted him the boon of taking his permanent abode here by his side. Stein remarks: "The inner portion of the lake, showing a deep blue colour, is supposed to mark the residence of Kāla or Śiva; the outer portion of a light green colour that of Nandin. Śiva is worshipped here under the name of Nandīśa." Kalhaṇa refers to Nandīkṣetra where the Śiva liṅgas were known as Vijayeśvara and Jyeṣṭheśa.<sup>77</sup> The latter is also referred to as Jyeṣṭharudra<sup>78</sup> which was a svayambhūḥ or natural stone. Close to this temple lies the *tīrtha* of Bhūteśvara which was very famous in Kalhaṇa's

time.<sup>79</sup> The Nandīkṣetra may be identified with the Nandī-kūṭa which is mentioned along with Kālodaka and Uttaramānasa in the *Anuśāsanaparva* and quoted by Lakṣmīdhara.<sup>80</sup> Kalhaṇa refers to Uttaramānasa,<sup>81</sup> which is identified by Stein with the sacred Gaṅgā lake situated below the eastern glaciers of Mount Haramokh, and is now popularly known as Gangabal. This is to be distinguished from the more famous Mānasa-sarovar, which is embedded in the Himalayas at a height of 14,950 ft. and is situated between Kailāśa on the north and Gurla Māndhātā on the south. Uttaramānasa is regarded as a sacred *tīrtha* by Lakṣmīdhara<sup>82</sup> and Vallālasena.<sup>83</sup>

Another popular *tīrtha* in Kashmir in the twelfth century was Gaṅgodbheda, which is referred to by Kalhaṇa in the following words: "There the goddess Sarasvatī herself is seen in the form of a swan in a lake (situated) on the summit of the Bhedagiri which is sanctified by the Gaṅgodbheda."<sup>84</sup> This *tīrtha* is referred in the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*,<sup>85</sup> compiled in the fourteenth century and also in Vanaparva,<sup>86</sup> *Matsya Purāṇa*,<sup>87</sup> *Padma Purāṇa*<sup>88</sup> and *Agni Purāṇa*.<sup>89</sup> It is situated at a height of 7,800 ft. It was also famous towards the end of the sixteenth century, when Abul Fazl recorded that in spite of such an altitude snow did not fall there. This was probably due to the fact that there is a large hot-water spring, the water from which forms a tank of warm water, which prevents it from freezing. Though the place was so famous in ancient and mediaeval India, yet it has now fallen into "complete oblivion," according to M. A. Stein. Ascribing two causes for this oblivion, he writes, "possibly the early season prescribed for the pilgrimage, the end of Chaitra, and the subsequent hardship of the journey may have caused the worshippers to fall off to transfer their attention to substitute *tīrthas* more conveniently accessible, such as the Bhedā Devī of Hal-Moghulpur".<sup>90</sup>

Kalhaṇa mentions the river Vitastā with great reverence.<sup>91</sup> This river was regarded as a holy one by Lakṣmīdhara<sup>92</sup> and

Vallālasena.<sup>93</sup> The *Vanaparva*,<sup>94</sup> *Kūrma Purāṇa*<sup>95</sup> and *Vāmana Purāṇa*<sup>96</sup> described the holiness of Vitastā. Kalhaṇa also speaks of the sanctity of the confluence of Vitastā with Sindhu, where many temples existed.<sup>97</sup> The *Nilamata Purāṇa* testifies to the sanctity of this place and identifies the Sindhu with Gaṅgā and the Vitastā with the Yamunā.

The most famous place of pilgrimage in Kashmir in the eleventh century was Śāradātīrtha, which is mentioned along with the famous *tīrthas* like Śrīpati, Raivataka and Bhadrakāleśvara in the *Matsya Purāṇa*.<sup>98</sup> Alberuni certainly did not visit Kashmir but he heard of the fame of Śāradā and wrote: "In Inner Kashmir, about two or three days' journey from the capital in the direction towards the mountains of Bolor, there is a weapon idol called Śāradā which is much venerated and frequented by pilgrims."<sup>99</sup> Kalhaṇa refers to it as a well-known place of pilgrimage.<sup>100</sup> Abūl Fazl in his *Āīn-i-Akbarī*<sup>101</sup> records that the temple of Śāradā, dedicated to Durgā begins to shake on the eighth day of the bright-half of every month and produces the most extraordinary effect. Such a famous place, however, fell into such obscurity that in 1892 Stein had to discover it with some difficulty. He writes: "The politically disturbed condition of the upper Kisan-Gaṅgā valley during the later Mughal and Pathan rule has had much to do with the neglect into which the shrine of Śāradā had fallen..... According to the traditions of the Gotheng Purohitas it was only since the establishment of the Dogra rule and the suppression of the Bomba troubles, that the route to Sardi became once more open for regular pilgrim-visits."<sup>102</sup> The vicissitudes of fortune of Śāradā show how political troubles affect the places of pilgrimage.

The most famous *tīrtha* of Kashmir in modern time is Amareśvara or Amarnātha situated in a cave, formed by a huge fissure on the south side of a snowy peak, 17,500 ft. high. But Kalhaṇa refers to it only once<sup>103</sup> and the *Nilamata Purāṇa* devotes only one *śloka*<sup>104</sup> to Amareśa. It is not described in any of the *Purāṇas*. Amareśvara, which Lakṣmīdhara

has described<sup>105</sup> from the *Vāmana Purāṇa* is another Amareśvara on mount Niṣadha. In the sixteenth century, the Kashmirian Amareśvara became famous. Abūl Fazl<sup>106</sup> relates that the image of Āmareśvara increases in size for 15 days from New Moon and decreases with the waning moon.

Another famous *tīrtha* referred to by Kalhaṇa is Pāpasūdana<sup>107</sup> where Śiva is worshipped under the name of Kapaṭeśvara. The story of the construction of a tank at Kapaṭeśvara by King Bhoja of Malwa is related in *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.<sup>108</sup> The fame of this place had reached Alberuni, who states,<sup>109</sup> that the people of Kashmir say that pieces of wood sent by Mahādeva appear annually in "a pond called Kudaishahr to the left of the source of Vitastā, in the middle of the month of Vaiśākha." Stein ascertained that Kudaishahr is a clerical error for Kapaṭeśvara. The place continued to enjoy celebrity towards the end of the sixteenth century when Abūl Fazl related that there was a deep spring in the village Katihar in which "when its water decreases, an image of Mahādeva in sandal-wood appears."<sup>110</sup>

The other Kashmirian *tīrthas* mentioned by Kalhaṇa, but not referred to by any Purāṇa excepting the Kashmiri *Nilamata*, nor described by any Non-Kashmiri Hindu writer are Chakradhara,<sup>111</sup> Nandikeśvara and Tripureśvara,<sup>112</sup> Mahāpadma,<sup>113</sup> Sureśvara,<sup>114</sup> Mahādeva,<sup>115</sup> the Sodara spring at Bhūteśa *tīrtha*,<sup>116</sup> the Takṣaka spring at Jayavana,<sup>117</sup> Vijayeśvara<sup>118</sup> and Mayagrāma.<sup>119</sup> The famous Mārtanda temple<sup>120</sup> built by Lalitāditya continues to attract pilgrims from all parts of India, but it was not probably recognised as a holy place of all-India fame in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The *Nilamata*<sup>121</sup> is the only Purāṇa to mention it.

Kṣemagupta (950-958 A.D.), the husband of the notorious Queen Diddā, is described by Kalhaṇa as proceeding to Varāhakṣetra for breathing his last.<sup>122</sup> According to the *Nilamata*<sup>123</sup> and *Haracharitchintāmaṇi* of Jayadratha,<sup>124</sup> Varāhakṣetra enjoyed great sanctity from early times. The



*Varāha Purāṇa*,<sup>125</sup> however, records that the places sacred to the incarnation of the Great Boar are Kokāmukha, Badarī and Lohārgala.

Kokāmukha is referred to in an inscription as holy place in the "Himabachchhikara" in the time of Budha Gupta<sup>126</sup> (477-495 A.D.). The *Varāha Purāṇa* refers to twenty sacred objects of visit at Kokāmukha. Lakṣmīdhara quotes *Varāha Purāṇa* to show that there is no holy place in the earth equal to Kokāmukha.<sup>127</sup> He also cites a verse from the Vanaparva (82.158) which states that if a person observing the vow of celibacy touches the image of Kokāmukha, he remembers the events of his previous births. Nundolal De and Kane<sup>128</sup> identify Kokāmukha with the Varāhakṣetra at Nathpur below the Trivenī formed by the junction of the three rivers Tāmar, Aruṇa and Suna Kuśī in the western portion of the Purnea district. Dr. D. C. Sircar, however, states: "The only Kauśikī that can be associated with a Kṣetra of Varāha as well as a river called Kokā is the Kauśikī, modern Kuśī. The ancient Kokāmukha *tīrtha* or Varāhakṣetra is situated on the bank of the Sun-Kośī in Nepal and is popularly Barahchhatra."<sup>129</sup>

Badarī or Badarīkāśrama is referred to as a holy place by Jīmūtavāhana, Somadeva, Lakṣmīdhara and the author of *Bṛhaspatya Arthasāstra*. Lakṣmīdhara in his *Tīrvhivivechana-kāṇḍa*<sup>130</sup> quotes verses from the *Varāha Purāṇa* to show the sanctity of the Brahmakuṇḍa only in Badarīkāśrama. As he does not refer to Agnisatyapāda, Indraloka, Pañchaśikhā, Chatuḥsrotaḥ, Vedadhārā, Dvādaśādityakuṇḍa, Lokapāla, Sthalakunḍa, Meruvara, Mānasadbhedā, Pañchasaraḥ, Somā-bhiṣekha, Somagiri, Urvaśikuṇḍa and other sites mentioned in the extant *Varāha Purāṇa*, it may legitimately be doubted whether these places had become famous in the first quarter of the twelfth century A.D.

The third place sacred to Varāha is Lohārgala. Nundolal De conjectures that it may be the same as Lohāghāt in Kumaun, three miles to the north of Champawat, on the river Lohā.<sup>131</sup> The *Varāha Purāṇa*, however, definitely states that the

Mlechchha Kings support or resort to it.<sup>132</sup> Dr. D. C. Sircar quotes Ch. 151 of the *Varāha Purāṇa* to show that the holy spots belonging to Lohārgala-tīrtha are in the land of the Mlechchhas in the Himalayas.<sup>133</sup> The Kumaun valley or any part of the Himalayan region did not fall into the hands of the Turks before the early part of the twelfth century when Lakṣmīdhara quoted 12 verses from Ch. 151 of this work. There are very important variations in readings between him and the printed editions of the *Purāṇa*. While the printed editions state that Lohārgala is thirty *Yojanas* from Siddhāvata, Lakṣmīdhara reads the word as "*Sindhostaṭe*". The verse quoted by Lakṣmīdhara may be thus translated:—"Having walked along the Sindhu through the Mlechchha land for 30 *Yojanas*, I stopped in the Himalayas and there has been made my residence called Lohārgala. That supremely secret place extends over five *yojanas*. It is very difficult to reach it and it is invincible. It is surrounded by Dhavanas (streams?). There I live occupying the northern side. Nobody knows of the image of mine placed there (*Kechinna jānate tatra svamūrtim mama saṁsthītān*). . . . . For 24 *Dvādaśis* (that is, one year at every twelfth day of the new-moon and waning-moon) offering, not without meat, has to be made for the purification of all desires. There is placed a horse decorated with all jewels, white like the petals of lily and endowed with Śaṅkha and Chakra. There is the bow called Sāruga, also rosary and *Kamaṇḍalu*. There in that secret place of mine called Lohārgala, good and holy seat, ornament and food should be offered."<sup>134</sup> These verses reveal that when this portion of *Varāha Purāṇa* was written Lohārgala had fallen into the hands of the Mlechchhas and out of fear for them the image had to be kept very secretly at a rather inaccessible place. A *yojana* usually means 9 miles, but sometimes it is used for a distance of 2½ miles and occasionally, 8 *Krośas* or 18 miles. Lohārgala was probably situated at a distance of 30 *yojanas* or 270 to 540 miles either from the river Sindhu or from the sea in the Himavanta. Stein has shown how

many *tīrthas* in the insecure or inaccessible places were shifted in course of time to safer and easily accessible areas. In the case of Lohārgala too, it is probable that the original site, thirty *yojanas* from the bank of Sindhu was shifted to a place situated at a distance of thirty *yojanas* from the Siddhavaṭa which, however, cannot be identified now. In any case, it is clear that Lakṣmīdhara did not omit even a *tīrtha*, which had fallen into the hands of the Mlechchhas. This is remarkable especially in view of the fact that many of the later treatises on *tīrtha* omit sacred places which had come under the control of the Mlechchhas.

The invasion of Sultān Mahmūd dealt a severe blow to some of the holy places of pilgrimage like Multan, Nagarkot, Mathura, Kanauj, Thaneshvara and Somanātha. The *Padma*,<sup>135</sup> *Brahma*<sup>136</sup> and *Bhaviṣya*<sup>137</sup> *Purāṇas* describe the sanctity of Multan or Mūlasthānapura, where Sāmba, son of Kṛṣṇa was cured of his leprosy by bathing in the Sūryakuṇḍa. In 641 A.D. Hiuen Tsang saw in the temple of Multan the golden image of the Sun. An Arab geographer in his "*Hudūd ul Ālam*", written in 982-983 A.D. states that "Multan is a big city and inside it is a big image and people go to this place for pilgrimage".<sup>138</sup> Alberunī states that the Hindus bathe in the pond "if they are not prevented"<sup>139</sup> and that "they used to visit Multan before its idol-temple was destroyed."<sup>140</sup> In another place he quotes the Kashmirian commentator, Utpalā to show that Multan was originally called Kāśyapapura, then Haṁsapura, then Bagapura, then Sāmbapura and then Mūlasthāna.<sup>141</sup> None of these names, however, occur in the list of holy places except Mathurā given by Lakṣmīdhara the author of *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra*, Jīmūtavāhana, Somadeva or in *Mānasollāsa*, *Devībhāgavata* or any other book written or compiled within two centuries of Sultān Mahmūd's invasion. The seizure of the places by the Turks, the obstacles hinted at by Alberuni were responsible for such omission.

Nagarkoṭ was a celebrated place of pilgrimage in the seventh century A.D., when Hiuen Tsang found men from every part of India coming to the shrine of Bhima Devi "to pay their vows and seek prosperity thereby."<sup>142</sup> Al 'Utbī states that the chiefs of the country and rich devotees used to present to the image rich treasures, which, being accumulated for ages, "had attained such an amount that the backs of camels would not carry it nor vessels contain it, nor writers' hands record it nor the imagination of an arithmetician conceive it".<sup>143</sup> All these were carried away. Lakṣmīdhara, Jīmūtavāhana or Bṛihaspati do not mention either Nagarkoṭ or its neighbouring town of Jvālāmukhi as a holy place. The omission may be due to the disturbed political condition of the area in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Towards the close of the sixteenth century, however, Abūl Fazl regarded it as one of the four holy Śākta Pīṭhas, where stood the shrine of Mahāmāyā, which attracted pilgrims from distant parts.<sup>144</sup> With the stabilization of political condition, the Hindus might have revived the practice of going there on pilgrimage.

The Vaiṣṇava *tīrtha* of Mathurā was devastated by Sultān Mahmūd. Hiuen Tsang found only five Deva temples in Mathurā, but in the beginning of the eleventh century, there were more than two thousand temples. Mathurā, according to Al 'Utbī, was surrounded by stone walls with two gates opening upon the river Yamunā flowing under the city. The beauty and grandeur of the city may be realised from the description of this historian who was a contemporary of Sultān Mahmūd. He writes: "On both sides of the city, there were a thousand houses, to which idol temples were attached, all strengthened from top to bottom by rivets of iron, and all made of masonry work; and opposite to them were other buildings supported on broad wooden pillars to give them strength. In the middle of the city there was a temple larger and firmer than the rest which can neither be described nor painted". There were five golden images, each five yards high, and two hundred silver images. "The Sultān gave

orders that all the temples should be burnt with naphtha and fire and levelled with the ground".<sup>145</sup> The city continued to be pillaged for twenty days. Even such a terrible carnage did not deter pious people from visiting or residing in and around Mathurā. Alberuni, writing a few years after the invasion, found it "crowded with Brāhmaṇas".<sup>146</sup>

The sanctity of Mathurā is described in the *Padma*<sup>147</sup> and *Varāha*<sup>148</sup> *Purāṇas*. Kūlidāsa compares the beauty of Vṛindāvana with that of Chaitraratha, garden of Kubera.<sup>149</sup> But the *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra* does not include Mathurā amongst the Mahā-kṣetras, sacred to the Vaiṣṇavas, nor does Jīmūtavāhana in his *Kālaviveka* cite it as an eminent place of pilgrimage. Vallālasena in his *Dānasāgara* does not refer to Mathurā, but he regards Govardhana, situated at a distance of 13 miles from Mathurā, as a place suitable for making ceremonial gifts. Śrīharsa in his *Naiṣadhacharita*, written in the latter half of the twelfth century, refers to Mathurā, Kāliyahrada, Vṛindāvana and Govardhana.<sup>150</sup>

Lakṣmīdhara, compiling the *Tīrthavivechanakāṇḍa* of *Kṛtyakalpataru* at the beginning of the twelfth century, gives a detailed account of Mathurā and its environment, mainly from the *Varāha Purāṇa* (ch. 152). Dr. Farquhar was totally ignorant of the existence of Lakṣmīdhara's work and, therefore, wrongly stated that the Mathurā-māhātmya section of *Varāha Purāṇa* was interpolated by Sanātana Gosvāmī, a follower of Śrī Chaitanya.<sup>151</sup> Dr. R. C. Hazra had not also the advantage of consulting the *Tīrthavivechanakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara and, therefore, pronounced this section of the *Varāha Purāṇa* as having been written later than the fifteenth century.<sup>152</sup> Apart from the other references to the holy sites in the Mathurā region, Lakṣmīdhara's quotations of eight pages from the *Varāha Purāṇa* (pp. 186-193), leave no doubt about the recognition of these *tīrthas* at the beginning of the twelfth century A.D.

Lakṣmīdhara quotes verses on the twenty-seven holy places in the Mathurā region from the *Varāha Purāṇa*. Of these,

only six, namely, Yamunā, Vṛindāvana, Bhāṇḍīraka, Rādhākunḍa, Govardhana and Kāliyahrada continue to be recognised and venerated by devotees up to the present day. The verse containing a description of Rādhākunḍa<sup>153</sup> is found in all the old manuscripts from which the book has been edited, but in the comparatively recent manuscript copied in 1638 A.D. and preserved in the Junior Bhonsle Mahārāja's library at Nagpur, the first line along with the proceeding three lines have been crossed out in red ink. This might have been done by some modern scholar, who was probably under the impression that Rādhākunḍa could not have been so old as this. The twenty-one other places mentioned by Lakṣmīdhara are Asikunḍa, Nandanavana, Yamalārjunakunḍa, Arkasthala, Vīrasthala, Kanaka, Prakīrtana, Somakunḍa, Piṇḍāraka, Jamvīra, Champaka, Karmāvarohana, Vītānaka, Ballabhaka, Uṣābhañjanaka, Vinduprabhā, Aṣṭamana, Tāmraprabha, Vatsaprakīrṇaka, Saptasamudraka and Nandīguhā. Not a single one of these places is mentioned in the modern Guide Books on Mathurā like the *Vrajadarpaṇa* and *Mathurā-o-Vṛindāvanadarpaṇa* by Brajamohan Das Babaji. These have fallen into oblivion and new places and shrines have come into prominence. In the first half of the sixteenth century Rūpa Gosvāmī compiled a book called *Mathurāmāhātmyam*, in which the sanctity of 68 places in the Mathurā region is described. But amongst these only two other places, besides the well-known six mentioned by Lakṣmīdhara are common to both these writers. These are Asikunḍa and Vatsakīrṇaka which may be the same as Lakṣmīdhara's Vatsa Prakīrṇaka. Lakṣmīdhara does not mention the twelve Vanas or forests of Mathurā, though the current *Varāha Purāṇa* described these forests.<sup>154</sup> Śrī Rūpa quotes verses from the *Ādivarāha* to describe the holiness of Madhuvana, Tālavana, Kumudavana, Kāmyavana, Vahulavana, Bhadravana, Khadiravana, Mahāvana, Lohajanghavana, Vilvavana, Bhāṇḍīravana and Vṛindāvana. He also cites the authority of the Mathurākhaṇḍa of the *Skanda Purāṇa* regarding Tālavana, Kāmyavana, Vahula-

vana and Vṛindāvana. The twelve Vanas, however, must be older than the 13th century because Narasiṃha in his *Pramāṇapallava* refers to them. *Bhaktiratnākara*, a work of the Bengal school of Vaiṣṇavism of the eighteenth century, quotes verses from the *Padma Purāṇa* regarding the location of the twelve Vanas—seven on the western and five on the eastern bank of the Yamunā and also from the *Skanda Purāṇa* corroborating the statement.<sup>155</sup> In speaking of Vṛindāvana, Lakṣmīdhara quotes a verse from the *Varāha Purāṇa* stating that "I (Varāha) will in future play there with cows and cowherds." Another notable omission by Lakṣmīdhara is Viśrāmaghāṭa, which is at present the holiest place in Mathurā. The presiding deity of Vṛindāvana according to the *Narasiṃha Purāṇa*<sup>156</sup> was Gopāla and that of Mathurā Svayambhūva, but at present it is Govinda and Dvārakādhīśa respectively.

Another place which was very severely affected by Sultān Mahmūd was Kanauj, whose importance was not only political but also religious. According to the *Mahābhārata*,<sup>157</sup> Rāma established the image of Vāmana at Kānyakubja on the bank of Kālinadī, which falls into the Ganges. The *Matsya Purāṇa*<sup>158</sup> described it as a place sacred to the Devī who is called here Gaurī. Al'Utbi says that there were at the time of Sultān Mahmūd's invasion nearly ten thousand temples and these were believed to have been founded two or three thousand years ago.<sup>159</sup> All these were broken to pieces. Kanauj does not seem to have recovered its importance as a place of pilgrimage again.

Thāneśvara, which was also sacked by Sultān Mahmūd, is the same as the holy Kurukṣetra, which is called Dharmakṣetra at the very beginning of the *Gītā*. The principal image was carried to Ghaznī for defilement and all others were destroyed. But this did not deter pilgrims from visiting the place. Vikramāditya VI in an inscription of 1082 A.D. refers to the holy places of Banaras, Kurukṣetra (Arghyatīrtha), Prayāga and Gayā.<sup>160</sup> Lakṣmīdhara quotes several verses from the *Vanaparva* (81.1-6, 190-204) in support of the holiness of the place. He also

cites the authority of the *Vāmana Purāṇa*.<sup>161</sup> Vallālasena quotes the authority of *Matsya Purāṇa* to show that Kurukṣetra is specially suitable for making gifts.<sup>162</sup>

The notorious sacking of Somanātha also could not produce any adverse effect on the streams of pilgrims visiting Prabhāsa and its contiguous Somanātha. Ibn Asir (born 1160 A.D.) states that on the occasion of lunar eclipse a hundred thousand persons used to congregate here. The number of pilgrims was so large on ordinary days also that three hundred persons were employed in shaving the heads and beards of the pilgrims. One thousand Brāhmanas used to attend to the worship of the Image.<sup>163</sup> The *Dvyāśraya Kāvya* of Hemachandra refers to the pilgrimage to Somanātha.<sup>164</sup> An inscription shows that two temples were built at Somanātha in 1216 A.D.<sup>165</sup> Lakṣmīdhara, however, does not refer to Somanātha as a place of pilgrimage. Jīmūtavāhana and Vallālasena refer to Prabhāsa but not to Somanātha.

Sultān Mahmūd himself did not come to Banaras, but his general, Ahmad Niyāltigin attacked it in 1033 A.D.<sup>166</sup> The impact of the attack must have been extremely negligible, because Baihaki writes: "The army could only remain there from morning to mid-day prayer, because of the peril. The markets of the drapers, perfumers, and jewellers were plundered but it was impossible to do more".<sup>167</sup> Alberuni states that the Hindu Sciences "retired far away from those parts of the country conquered by us and have fled to places which our hands have not yet reached, to Kashmir, Benaras and other places".<sup>168</sup> He further informs us that Benaras attracted anchorites in thousands from all parts of India. Lakṣmīdhara assigns the first and the most prominent place amongst *tīrthas* to Vārānaśī, to the description of which 122 pages are devoted out of 264 pages of *Tirthavivechanakāṇḍa*. He quotes verses extensively from the *Liṅga Purāṇa* and some verses from the *Matsya*, *Brahma* and *Skanda Purāṇas*. He has given an exhaustive account of the shrines, ponds, wells and places which were regarded as holy at the beginning of the eleventh century. He mentions<sup>169</sup> the



temple of Keśava situated at the confluence of the Varāṇā and the Gaṅgā. where successive Gāhaḍavāla kings like Chandra-deva, Madanapāla, Govindachandra and Jayachchandra are known from inscriptions to have made numerous gifts. The *Narasīṃha Purāṇa* quoted by Lakṣmīdhara<sup>170</sup> also states that the chief Viṣṇu image of Vārāṇasī is Keśava. There must have been several temples of Keśava in the eleventh century, because the Chandravatī grant of 1100 A.D. refers to the image of the God Ādi-Keśava before whom Chandradeva made a gift of a thousand cows, gold and other valuables equal to his weight.<sup>171</sup> Jayachchandra records in his Kamauli grant dated 1173 A.D. the gift of several villages after bathing in the Ganges at Vārāṇasī in the presence of the God Ādi-Keśava<sup>172</sup> Other inscriptions refer to the Śiva Liṅgas like Vedeśvara, Aghoreśvara, Krittivāseśvara, Indreśvara, Oṃkāreśvara, Pañchaukara, Lauḍeśvara, Trilochaneśvara and Svapneśvara at Benaras. All these Liṅgas excepting the last four are also mentioned by Lakṣmīdhara. Dr. Altekar in his *History of Benaras*<sup>173</sup> points out that "scores of land-grants made by the Gāhaḍavāla princes in the presence of different gods of Banaras have been discovered so far, but curiously enough, only one is seen being made in the presence, and after the worship, of Viśvanāth".<sup>174</sup> K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar in his *Introduction to the Tīrthavivechanakāṇḍam*<sup>175</sup> states that Viśveśvara is mentioned twice by Lakṣmīdhara, but the reference in page 27 is merely to Śiva or Avimukteśvara respectively, as "Lord of the Universe" and the second reference in page 93 is to "an ordinary Liṅga, like hundreds of others, whose *darśana* confers a lower benefit than *mukti*". The *Liṅga Purāṇa*, which is quoted by Lakṣmīdhara,<sup>176</sup> gives the pre-eminence to the Svayambhū-liṅga of Avimukteśvara which had revealed itself by piercing its way through the ground. Vāchaspatimiśra in the fifteenth century identified this Avimukteśvara with Viśvanātha (*Tīrthachintāmaṇi* p. 360) but Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa in 1560 and Mitramiśra (c. 1620 A.D.) did not accept the view because the *Padma Purāṇa*, *Kāśīkhaṇḍa* and the *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* distinguish bet-

ween the two. In the twelfth century Viśvanatha or Viśveśvara, however, must have been a prominent Liṅga, and not just as one of the ordinary ones as Aiyangar tries to make out, because it is mentioned in a contemporary Gāhaḍavāla inscription and also in the *Kūrma Purāṇa* (I. 30. 2) as one of the six prominent deities of Banaras. According to the *Kūrma Purāṇa*, the most important deity of Banaras is the Pañchāyatana Liṅga, and next to it are Krittivāseśvara, Madhyameśvara, Viśveśvara, Oṃkāra and Kapardīśvara.

Dr. Altekar further points out that "among the numerous grants made at Banaras by the Gāhaḍavālas, none so far has been made after a bath at the Daśāśvamedha or the Pañchagaṅgā *ghāṭ* or in the presence of Bindumādhava or Kālabhairava or Durgā".<sup>177</sup> Lakṣmīdhara, however, refers<sup>178</sup> to the sanctity of the Daśāśvamedha *ghāṭ* of the Gaṅgā on the authority of *Vāmana Purāṇa*. He also mentions the shrine of Durgā near the Bhairaveśvara Liṅga (p. 85). The chief consort of Śiva, however, at Vārāṇasī, according to Lakṣmīdhara, was Viśālākṣī and not Annapūrṇā. There is a reference to Indramādhava in an inscription of 1114-15 A.D.<sup>179</sup>

The Bangavan plate of Govindachandra and his queen Gosaladevī of the year 1150-51 A.D. states that the queen having bathed in the Ganges near the temple of the Sun-god Lolārka in the presence of that deity gave a village to a Brāhmaṇa, who had come from Pāṭaliputra.<sup>180</sup> Lolārka is also mentioned as a prominent deity by Lakṣmīdhara.<sup>181</sup> The contemporary inscriptions refer also to the Kapālamochanaghaṭṭa in 1122, 1127 and 1141 A.D.<sup>182</sup> and to Vedeśvaraghaṭṭa in 1130, 1144 and 1154 A.D.<sup>183</sup> The sanctity of Vārāṇasī is also described in glowing terms in the *Naiṣadhacharita*.<sup>184</sup> In 1194 A.D. Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak attacked Banaras and destroyed about one thousand temples.<sup>185</sup>

Lakṣmīdhara assigns the second important place amongst the holy *tīrthas* to Prayāga. He quotes verses from Chapters 104 to 109 of the *Matsya Purāṇa* to illustrate the sanctity of the place and its sub-tīrthas.<sup>186</sup> He concludes the section

with the quotation of a verse from the *Mahābhārata*. The sub-tīrthas mentioned by Lakṣmīdhara are: (1) Kāmbalā-Aśvatara, (2) Pratiṣṭhāna, (3) Haṁsaprataṭāpana, (4) Urvaṣī-pulina, (5) Koṭitīrtha, (6) Bhogavatī, (7) Daśāśvamedhaka, (8) Mānasa, (9) Rīṇamochana, (10) Agnitīrtha, (11) Dharmarājatīrtha, (12) Bānaraka or Bāsaraka which according to Kane<sup>187</sup> is a misreading for Anaraka, (13) Nirujaka, (14) Karūtīrtha, (15) Agnikuṇḍa and (16) Siddhi-Kṣetra. The most notable omission in this list is the famous Akṣaya-vaṭa, where according to the *Agni*<sup>188</sup> and *Kūrma*<sup>189</sup> *Purāṇas*, suicide is the surest way to the highest heaven. The Akṣaya-vaṭa is referred to in the Jabbalpur inscription of Yaśaḥ Karṇa dated 1122 A.D. in the following words, "Gāṅgeyadeva, fond of residing at the foot of the holy big tree of Prayāga found salvation (i.e. committed suicide) there together with his 100 wives".<sup>190</sup>

The next important *tīrtha* described by Lakṣmīdhara is Gayā. The twenty holy sites in this place, according to him, are (1) Akṣaya-vaṭa, (2) Udyanta Parvata, (3) Kanakhala, (4) Kauśikī, (5) Kauśikī-hrada, (6) Gayāśira, (7) Gridhravaṭa, (8) Champakavana, (9) Dharmapriṣṭha, (10) Dhenuka, (11) Pāṇḍu-viśālya tīrtha, (12) Phalgutīrtha, (13) Brahmatīrtha, (14) Brahma-sara, (15) Brahmāranya, (16) Bharatāśrama, (17) Mānasa-sara, (18) Mārtaṇḍapādāmūla, (19) Muṇḍapriṣṭha and (20) Yonidvāra. The sacred hills of Rāmaśilā and Pretaśilā described in the Gayāmāhātmya section of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* (ch. III) are not mentioned by Lakṣmīdhara. The Anuśāsanaparva of the *Mahābhārata*, however, mentions Aśmapriṣṭha, which is identified by Kane<sup>191</sup> as the Pretaśilā. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa in his *Tristhalisetu* (1560 A.D.) lays the greatest emphasis on the performance of *Śrāddha* at Rāmaśilā and Pretaśilā; but the silence of Lakṣmīdhara probably indicates that these places had not risen to such importance in his time. K. V. Ranga-swami Aiyangar observes that when Lakṣmīdhara "omits to mention rules now in vogue it is not unsafe to presume that either they came into effect after his time or that he rejected

their validity and declined to notice them in a work of authority".<sup>192</sup> The same, however, cannot be said of the omission of names of some sites in a particular place, as we have seen from inscriptional evidence that the Akṣayavaṭa of Prayāga was definitely an important place, though it has been omitted by Lakṣmīdhara. A similar omission is noticeable in the case of Gayā. He notices Gayāśira, which extends from Krauñchāpāda up to the Phalgutīrtha and includes Viṣṇupāda but he does specifically mention Viṣṇupāda. Aiyangar<sup>193</sup> indeed expresses surprise over the silence of Lakṣmīdhara regarding the name of Gadādhara, who is now regarded as the presiding deity of Gayā. He points out that from his quotation from *Vāmana Purāṇa* 'Gopati'<sup>194</sup> and from the *Narasimha Purāṇa* 'Janārdana' appear to be the principal deities of Gayā.<sup>195</sup> But in page 253 Lakṣmīdhara has quoted the *Narasimha Purāṇa* again to show that Gadādhara is the presiding deity. The *Vāyu Purāṇa* mentions Bodhidruma Aśvattha as a sacred tree at which *Śrāddha* has to be performed. This indicates the rapprochement between Hinduism and Buddhism in an age later than that of Lakṣmīdhara, who is silent over the Bodhi tree. An inscription of the reign of Nayapāla engraved about 1040 A.D. states that prince Yakṣapāla dug up the famous Uttaramānasa lake.<sup>196</sup> Dr. Barua concludes from this that Uttaramānasa did not exist before 1040 A.D.<sup>197</sup> But had there been no lake of that name before 1040 A.D., it could not have been referred to as "famous" in the inscription of the time of Nayapāla.

Vārāṇasī, Prayāga and Gayā were considered the three most important places of pilgrimage and these were referred to as "Tristhali" by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. Vāchaspatimiśra attached equal importance to Puruṣottama. In his *Tīrthachintāmaṇi*, he quotes as many as 122 pages from the *Brahma Purāṇa* to describe the sanctity of Puri or Puruṣottama. On the authority of this Purāṇa he states that during one week commencing from the tenth day of the bright-half of the month of Jyaiṣṭha as many as 52 *tīrthas* and 32 holy rivers

assemble at Puruṣottama. The present temple of Puruṣottama was erected, according to the *Mādalā-Paṇji*, by Anangabhīma III, the grandson of Choḍagaṅga in 1198 A.D.<sup>198</sup> But we have already pointed out that Puruṣottama, according to the inscription of Gaṅgādharma, attracted pilgrims from the interior of the district of Gayā early in the twelfth century.<sup>199</sup>

Most of the *tīrthas* were sacred to particular sects, while a few like Vārāṇasī, Gayā and Prayāga were venerated by all. The only *tīrtha* sacred to Brahmā in the twelfth century was Puṣkara. We have already shown that the concept of the twelfth Jyotirlingas probably had not been known in the eleventh or twelfth century A.D. Lakṣmīdhara gives a long list of the following 67 Vaiṣṇava *tīrthas* with the names of their presiding deities from the *Narasimha Purāṇa*:

<i>Place</i>	<i>Identification of the Place</i>	<i>Presiding Deity</i>
1 Kokāmukha	either in the Purnea district or in Nepal.	Varāha
2 Mandāra	Banka subdivision, 30 miles to the south of Bhagalpur in Bihar.	Madhusūdana
3 Kapiladvīpa	not identified	Ananta
4 Prabhāsa	near Somanātha	Ravinandana
5 Rīṣabha	may be Palni hills in Madura	Mahāviṣṇu
6 Dvārakā	near Okhā in Kathiwar	Bhūpati
7 Pāṇḍisahya	not identified	Deveśa
8 Vasutuṅga	not identified	Jagatpati
9 Matsyodapāna	not identified	Vaikuṇṭha
10 Mahendra	Ganjam district	Nṛipāntakam
11 Bhallivana	not identified	Mahāyogin
12 Chitrakūṭa	65 miles south-west of Prayāga	Narādhīpam
13 Naimiṣa	45 miles north-west of Lucknow	Pītavāsa
14 Niṣkramaṇa	not identified	Hari
15 Śālagrāma	near the source of the Gaṇḍaka on the border of Nepal & Tibet	Tapovāsa
16 Gandhamādāna	the mountain on which Badrināth is situated	Achintya
17 Kubjāmṛaka	at or near Hardwar	Hṛṣīkeśa
18 Gaṅgādvāra	Hardwar	Payodhara
19 Toṣalaka	Dhaulti in the Puri district	Garuḍadhvaṇa

<i>Place</i>	<i>Identification of the Place</i>	<i>Presiding Deity</i>
20 Nāgasāhvaya	Hastināpur, 22 miles north-east of Meerut	Govinda
21 Vrindāvana	Uttar Pradesh	Gopāla
22 Mathurā	Uttar Pradesh	Svayambhūva
23 Kedāra	Tehri Garhwal	Mādhava
24 Vārāṇasī	Banaras	Keśava
25 Puškara	near Ajmer	Puṣkarākhyā
26 Dhriṣadvatī	not identified	Dhriṣadvajā
27 Trinavinduvana	not identified	Vīram
28 Sindhusāgara	not identified	Anoka
29 Kuśivatta	not identified	Mahāvāhu
30 Taijasavana	west of Kurukṣetra	Amrita
31 Viśākhayūpa	near Kurukṣetra	Viśvesa
32 Mahāvana	near Mathurā	Narasimha
33 Lohārgala	30 Yojanas from Sindhu	Ripuhara
34 Devaśālā	not identified	Trivikrama
35 Kuśavana	not identified	Puruṣottama
36 Kubjāka	not identified	Vāmana
37 Vitastā	Kasmira	Vidyādhara
38 Varāha	not identified	Dharaṇīdhara
39 Devadāruvana	near Badrinātha	Guhya
40 Kāverī	may be Śrīraṅgaṇ	Nāgaśāyin
41 Prayāga	Allahabad	Yogamūrti
42 Payoṣṇyī	Purna river in Berar	Sundara
43 Kumāratīrtha	not identified	Kaumāra
44 Lauhitya	Bramhaputra	Hayaśīrṣa
45 Ujjainī	Modern Ujjain	Vikrama
46 Vidyallīṅga-sphoṭa	not identified	Chaturbhuja
47 Tuṅgabhadrā		Harihara
48 Kurukṣetra		Viśvarūpa
49 Maṇikuṇḍa	not identified	Halāyudha
50 Ayodhyā		Lokanātha
51 Kuṇḍīna	Vidarbha	Rukmiṇīpati
52 Bhāṇḍīra	near Mathurā	Vāsudeva
53 Chakratīrtha (8 places)	not identified	Sudarśana
54 Viṣṇupāda	not identified	Ādya
55 Sūkara	Soron between Bareilly and Mathurā	Sūkara
56 Mānasatīrtha	in the Himalayas	Brahmeśa

Place	Identification of the Place	Presiding Deity
57 Daṇḍaka		Śyāmala
58 Trikūṭa	near Nasik	Nāgamokṣa
59 Merukūṭa	not identified	Bhāskara
60 Puṣpabhadra	northern slope of the Himalayas	Viraja
61 Chamikahara	not identified	Vala
62 Vipāśā		Yaśaṣkara
63 Māhiṣmatī	in Nemad district of Madhya Pradesh	Hutāśana
64 Kṣīrābdha	not identified	Padmanābha
65 Vimala	not identified	Sanātana
66 Śivanadī	not identified	Śivakara
67 Gayā		Gadādhara

This list is important for more than one reason. First, it shows that the Vaiṣṇava shrines were spread throughout the length and breadth of India in the twelfth century. Secondly, the list omits the name of Puruṣottama. Though the *Narasimha Purāṇa* says that it is giving a list of 68 places, yet in Lakṣmīdhara's quotation we actually find 67 places. Was the 68th place Puruṣottama, which has been purposely dropped by Lakṣmīdhara? Thirdly, names like Kṛṣṇa, Mādhava, Devakīnandana, Nandanandana, Yaśodānandana, Gopinātha, Madanamohana etc. do not occur amongst the names of deities. The worship of Viṣṇu under these names had not become popular at the time of the composition of the 15th chapter of the *Narasimha Purāṇa*. Lastly, 22 out of 67 places mentioned in the list have fallen into such obscurity that they cannot be identified.

Lakṣmīdhara cites<sup>201</sup> the authority of the *Matsya Purāṇa* to show that only four places are sacred to Gaurī, namely Viśālākṣī at Vūrāṇasī, Lalitā at Prayāga, Maṅgalā at Gayā, and Sīmḥikā at Kriṭaśaucha (not identified). He mentions Kāmarūpa indeed but is silent over the name of any Devī in this country. The 13th chapter of the *Matsya Purāṇa* which is current at present, gives, however, a long list of places holy to the Devī. It is not improbable that this list

has been added to the *Matsya Purāṇa* long after Lakṣmīdhara. Dr. D. C. Sircar has shown that the text of the thirteenth chapter of the *Matsya Purāṇa* "has been quoted in the description of the various manifestations of Bhadrakarṇikā in the Revākhaṇḍa sub-section of the Avantyakhaṇḍa in the *Skanda Purāṇa* (which in its present form is not earlier than the twelfth century) as well as in the enumeration of the different names of the goddess Sāvitrī, the wife of Brahman, in the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa section (ch. 17) of the *Padma Purāṇa*. The same text is also quoted in the *Devībhāgavata* (VII. ch. 30) which, unlike the *Matsya*, *Skanda* and *Padma Purāṇas*, refer to the holy places associated in this work with the different manifestations of the mother-goddess and of her consort".<sup>202</sup>

The seventh *Paṭala* of the *Hevajra Tantra*, which is ascribed to the seventh or eighth century A.D., mentions only four *Pīṭhas*, namely Jālandhara, Oddiyāna in the Swat Valley, Pūrṇagiri and Kāmarūpa. The *Rudrayāmala*, which is considered to have been composed earlier than 1052 A.D. mentions ten *Pīṭhas* as follows:—Kāmarūpa, Jālandhara. Pūrṇagiri, Oddiyāna, Vārāṇasī, Jvalantī, Māyāvātī or Hardwar, Madhupurī or Mathurā, Ayodhyā and Kāñchī. An Upa-Purāṇa named *Mahābhāgavata*, which is not to be confused with the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata*, praises (chapters 11-12, 76-78) Kāmarūpa which is called the best of the 51 *Mahāpīṭhas* created by the fall of Satī's limbs. This Upa-Purāṇa, according to Dr. R. C. Hazra<sup>203</sup> cannot be dated later than the twelfth century. Dr. D. C. Sircar's work on the Śākta *Pīṭhas* was published in December, 1948 and as such could not contain any reference to the *Mahābhāgavata*. Having carefully compared the Paurāṇic list of *Pīṭhas* with that contained in the later Tantras mentioned by Dr. Sircar, we notice the omission of the following in the list given in the *Devī Bhāgavata*: (1) Hīṅgula, (2) Suganghā (in Barisal), (3) Kashmir, (4) Jvālāmukhī, (5) Jālandara (6) Virajākṣetra at Jaipur in Orissa, (7) Gaṇḍakī, (8) Bahula, (9) Ujjainī. (10) Chaṭṭāla, (11) Tri-



pūrā, (12) Trisrotā, (13) Yugādya, (14) Kālīpīṭha or Kālīghāṭa, (15) Prayāga, (16) Jayanti, (17) Kiriṭa, (18) Maṇikarṇikā, (19) Kanyāśrama, (20) Kurukṣetra, (21) Rāmagiri, (22) Śuchi, (23) Pañchasāgara, (24) Karotoyātaṭa (in the district of Bogra), (25) Śrīparvata, (26) Vibhāsa (Tamluk in the Midnapore district), (27) Bhairavaparvata, (28) Janasthāna (near Nasik), (29) Ratnāvalī, (30) Mitnilā, (31) Nalahāṭi in the district of Murshidabad, West Bengal, (32) Vakeśvara in the district of Birbhum, (33) Yaśora—modern Jessore in East Pakistan (34) Aṭṭahāsa in the district of Birbhum, (35) Nandipura, (36) Laṅkā, (37) Virāṭa.

Lakṣmīdhara does not include any of the following sites considered as *Pīṭhas* in later times: (1) Acchhoda in Kashmir, (2) Agastyāśrama near Nasik, (3) Ambara in Jaipur, Rajputana, (4) Ambikā at Kālnā, District Burdwan, (5) Aśvapara, District Gauhaṭi, (6) Aṭṭahāsa (Lābhpur), District Birbhum, (7) Bahula (near Katwa) district Burdwan, (8) Bālidāngā (Hoogly district), (9) Bālipura, (10) Bhadreśvara, (11) Chaṭṭala (12) Ekāmra, (13) Ilāpur, (14) Ghāṭsilā (Midnapore district), (15) Hinglāja, (16) Jālandhara, (17) Jvālāmukhī, (18) Kālighāṭa (Calcutta), (19) Kāmagiri, (20) Kāñchī, (21) Kānyakubja (22) Kiriṭa, (23) Kṣīragrāma (near Katwa, Burdwan), (24) Mataṅga near Gayā, (25) Mēhara in Tippera District, (26) Mithilā, (27) Nalahāṭi (28) Nandipura (Sainthia, district Birbhum), (29) Nīlāchala (Puri), (30) Puṇḍravardhana (Bogra), (31) Rājagriha (Rajgir, Patna), (32) Tāmralipta (Tamluk), (33) Tārā (Tārāpur, Birbhum), (34) Tripurā, (35) Ujānī (Kogrām, Burdwan), (36) Vaidyanātha (modern Deoghar-Baidyanāthdham, Santhal Parganas), (37) Vakeśvara (38) Yasora. Lakṣmīdhara does not also refer to Tārāchāṇḍī at Sasaram (Shahabad) where an inscription of Pratāpadhavala dated 1169 A.D. mentions the name of the goddess Tārāchāṇḍī.

Two inferences can be drawn from such omissions. First, many of the Śākta *Pīṭhas* had not come into existence in the early part of the twelfth century when Lakṣmīdhara wrote

*Kṛityakalpataru*. Secondly, even the few *Pīṭhas* which existed in his time were purposely ignored by him probably because he did not like to encourage the Tāntric cult. In this connection it may be noted that many of the Śākta *Pīṭhas* are located in Assam, Bengal and Bihar, which became the centres of Tāntricism in the later middle ages.

Assam and Bengal had very few ancient orthodox type of holy sites up to the twelfth century. In Bengal the only famous *tīrtha* was Gaṅgāsāgara or Kapilāśrama.

It is difficult to imagine now the hardship which the pilgrims had to undergo in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. Lakṣmīdhara does not consider it obligatory for a pilgrim to walk on foot. Very few people could afford to engage conveyances. Some of the places of pilgrimage had no road and the pilgrims, always moving in large bands, had to improvise some kind of path by cutting down the jungle or remove the various obstacles. Bandits often lay in ambush to relieve the pilgrims of all their belongings. A special tax was levied on pilgrims by some of the princes. Many bold and enterprising people sought an outlet for their energy in going out on pilgrimage, rather than engage themselves in constructive work for ameliorating the social and economic condition of their fellow beings.

## REFERENCES TO CHAPTER XIV

(Tirthas or Places of Pilgrimage.)

- 1 *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra* III. 79-80.
- 2 EI. XX. 127.
- 3 Kane, HDS IV. p. 770.
- 4 *Varāha Purāṇa* Ch. 152. 62, 154. 29.
- 5 EI. III. 46-50.
- 6 JRASB (Letters) XIII. No. 2 (1947) p. 70.
- 7 EI. XIV. 194.
- 8 JUPHS. XIV (July 1941) p. 70.
- 9 IA. XVIII. 130 ; EI. IX. 304 etc.
- 10 *Kīrttikaumudī* IX. 2.

- 11 El. II. 330-42, verse 12 in Page 334.
- 12 KV (ed BI) p. 351.
- 13 El. XXV. 312-313.
- 14 El. I. 271-287, verses 23-33.
- 15 *Śiva Purāṇa* Ch. I. 14-33, IV. 1-18, 21-24.
- 16 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 93 (*liṅgam vośveśara nāma sarvadevaistu vanditami*).
- 17 *Skanda Purāṇa*, Kedārakhaṇḍa Ch. 7. 31-33.
- 18 Sachau I. 116.
- 19 *Ibid.* I. 117.
- 20 *Ibid.* II. 146.
- 21 *Ibid.* II. 147.
- 22 *Ibid.* II. 148.
- 23 *Kathāsaritsāgara* (ed. Tawney) Vol. I. p. 31.
- 24 *Ibid.* I. 384, 533.
- 25 *Ibid.* I. 418.
- 26 *Ibid.* II. 195.
- 27 *Ibid.* II. 234, 293.
- 28 *Ibid.* II. 335.
- 29 Introduction p. XVIII to *Tīrthavivechana*.
- 30 Kane: HDS I. p. 196, IV. p. X.
- 31 KV. p. 323.
- 32 *Ibid.* p. 357.
- 33 *Brihannāradya Purāṇa* II. 60. 25.
- 34 *Garuḍa Purāṇa*, I. 81. 10.
- 35 *Dānasāgara*, pp. 35-40.
- 36 *Matsya Purāṇa*, Ch. 22. 68.
- 37 *Māṇasollāsa* (G. O. S. No. 28, p. 13) *Vinśatī* I. Ch. 18. (*Tīrthasāna adhyāya*).
- 38 JA. IV. 76.
- 39 *Ibid.* IV. 112.
- 40 *Ibid.* p. 266.
- 41 *Ibid.* p. 268.
- 42 *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra*, III. 110-133.
- 43 *Varāha Purāṇa*, 155. 1.
- 44 *Padma Purāṇa*, VI. 110. 8 and 280. 19.
- 45 *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, X. 79. 14.
- 46 *Matsya Purāṇa*, 22. 44.
- 47 *Padma Purāṇa*, VI. 280. 19.
- 48 JRASB (Letters) XIV. (1948) 14-15.
- 49 Kane: HDS IV. 769.
- 50 *Descriptive Catalogue of Mss. in Mithila*, Vol. I. p. 294.
- 51 *Matsya Purāṇa*, Ch. 190. 6.
- 52 El. XX. 249 and PRAS. 1902-03, p. 20f.
- 53 *Ibid.* XX. 48.
- 54 *Ibid.* XX. p. 49.

- 55 *Varāha Purāṇa*, 145. 71.
- 56 *Mbh.* Vanaparva, 85. 37.
- 57 *El.* XXX. Pt. I (Jan. 1953) p. 11.
- 58 *RC* III. 10.
- 59 *Ibid.* III. 10.
- 60 *Struggle for Empire*, p. 298.
- 61 *Naiṣadhacharita* (ed. Handiqui), XI. 107.
- 62 *Ibid.* XI. 114.
- 63 *Ibid.* XVII. 90.
- 64 *RT* III. 297, 320; VII. 646, 1007, 1010; VIII. 13.
- 65 *Ibid.* IV. 414, VII. 1477.
- 66 *Ibid.* VI. 254, VII. 1008, 1478.
- 67 *Ibid.* I. 38.
- 68 *Mbh.* Vanaparva, 130. 10.
- 69 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 245.
- 70 Sachau. II. 148.
- 71 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 248.
- 72 *Dānasāgara*, p. 37.
- 73 *Mbh.* Anusāsanaparva, 26. 60.
- 74 *Viṣṇudharmasūtra* (ed. Jolly), 85. 35.
- 75 *RT.* I. 36, 407.
- 76 *Nīlamata Purāṇa*, verses 1048-1119 (De Vreese).
- 77 *RT.* I. 113.
- 78 *Ibid.* IV. 190.
- 79 *Ibid.* I. 107, V. 55, VIII. 2756.
- 80 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 248.
- 81 *RT.* III. 448.
- 82 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 248.
- 83 *Dānasāgara*, p. 37.
- 84 *RT.* I. 35.
- 85 *SP.* verse 628.
- 86 *Mbh.* Vanaparva, 84. 65.
- 87 *Matsya Purāṇa*, 22. 25.
- 88 *Padma Purāṇa*, I. 32. 39.
- 89 *Agni Purāṇa*, ch. 109. 18.
- 90 Stein in *RT.* Vol. II. p. 278.
- 91 *RT.* I. 28; IV. 301.
- 92 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 245.
- 93 *Dānasāgara*, p. 37.
- 94 *Mbh.* Vana 82. 88-90.
- 95 *Kūrma Purāṇa*, II. 44.
- 96 *Vāmana Purāṇa*, 90. 7.
- 97 *RT.* V. 99-100, VI. 305, VII. 214, VIII. 3149.
- 98 *Matsya Purāṇa*, 22. 74.
- 99 Sachau I. 117.
- 100 *RT.* VIII. 2556, 1706.

- 101 *Āīn-i-Akbarī* (ed. and Trans. Jarrett) II. p. 366.
- 102 Stein in RT. Vol. II. p. 288.
- 103 RT. I. 267.
- 104 *Nilamata Purāṇa*, verse 1321 (ed. De Vreese).
- 105 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 236.
- 106 *Āīn-i-Akbarī* (ed. and Trans. Jarrett) II p. 360.
- 107 RT. I. 32.
- 108 *Ibid.* VII 190-193.
- 109 Sachau II. 181.
- 110 *Āīn-i-Akbarī* (ed. and Trans. Jarrett), II. p. 358.
- 111 RT. VII. 258.
- 112 *Ibid.* VII. 956-57
- 113 *Ibid.* I. 30, IV. 593.
- 114 *Ibid.* V. 38.
- 115 *Ibid.* II. 410, 456.
- 116 *Ibid.* I. 123, II. 109.
- 117 *Ibid.* II. 458.
- 118 *Ibid.* I. 38.
- 119 *Ibid.* VII. 126, VIII. 729.
- 120 *Ibid.* IV. 192, VII. 709.
- 121 *Nilamata Purāṇa*, verses 103-105.
- 122 RT. VI. 186 .
- 123 *Nilamata Purāṇa*, verse 1358 (ed. de Vreese).
- 124 *Haracharitchintamāṇi* XII. 43.
- 125 *Varāha Purāṇa*, 140. 4-5.
- 126 EI. XV. 138-39.
- 127 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 213.
- 128 Kane: HDS IV. p. 768.
- 129 *IHQ.* XXI. No.1 (1945) p. 59.
- 130 *Tīrthavivechana*, pp 215-16.
- 131 De, N.: *Geographical Dictionary of Ancient India*, p. 115.
- 132 *Varāha Purāṇa*, 140. 5.
- 133 *IHQ.* XXI. p. 58.
- 134 *Tīrthavivechana*, pp. 228-29.
- 135 *Padma Purāṇa*, I. 13.
- 136 *Brahma Purāṇa*, I. 40.
- 137 *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, ch. 74.
- 138 PIHC. 1939 (Calcutta Session), p. 667.
- 139 Sachau II. 145.
- 140 *Ibid.* II. 148.
- 141 *Ibid.* I. 298.
- 142 Beal: *Hiuen Tsang*, Vol. I. 113 note.
- 143 HIED II p. 34.
- 144 *Āīn-i-Akbarī* (ed. and Trans. Jarrett), Vol. II. pp. 312-14.
- 145 HIED II pp. 44-45
- 146 Sachau II. 147.

- 147 *Padma Purāṇa*, Ādi. ch. 29. 46-47.
- 148 *Varāha Purāṇa*, ch. 152-78.
- 149 *Raghuvamśa* VI. 50.
- 150 *Naiṣadhacharita*, XI. 106-7.
- 151 Farquhar, J. N.: *An Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, pp. 309-310.
- 152 Hazra, R. C.: *Studies in Puranic Records*, p. 105.
- 153 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 190 —“*Rādhākṣṇṇīti vikhyātam tasmīn kṣetre paramam mama/tatra snānam tu kurvīta ckarātṛṣṭita naraḥ*”
- 154 *Varāha Purāṇa*, ch. 153 ; ch. 161. 6-10.
- 155 Quoted in *Bhaktiratnākara*, p. 185.
- 156 *Narasimha Purāṇa*, ch. 65 quoted in *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 252.
- 157 *Mbh.* Anuśāsana 4. 17.
- 158 *Matsya Purāṇa*, 13. 29.
- 159 Commentary by Hodiwalla in HIED II (Aligarh ed.), p. 46.
- 160 EI. XVIII p. 179.
- 161 *Vāmana Purāṇa*, 52 quoted in *Tīrthavivechana*, pp. 175-79.
- 162 *Dōnasāgara*, p. 37.
- 163 Commentary by Hodiwalla in HIED II (Aligarh ed.), p. 474.
- 164 IA. IV. 76.
- 165 EI. II. 437-446.
- 166 HIED. II. p. 122.
- 167 *Ibid.* p. 123.
- 168 Sachau I. 22.
- 169 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 44.
- 170 *Ibid.* p. 252.
- 171 EI. XIV. pp. 197-200.
- 172 EI. IV. 123-24.
- 173 Altekar, A. S. *History of Benares*, p. 29.
- 174 EI. VII. 159.
- 175 Introduction, p. LXXIII to *Tīrthavivechana*.
- 176 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 41.
- 177 Altekar, *Op. cit.* p. 29.
- 178 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 237.
- 179 EI. VIII p. 149.
- 180 EI. V. 118.
- 181 *Tīrthavivechana*, pp. 34, 118.
- 182 EI. IV. 97-133.
- 183 EI. VIII. 149-59.
- 184 *Naiṣadhacharita*, XI. 114, 116.
- 185 HIED II. 222.
- 186 *Tīrthavivechana*, p. 136-153.
- 187 HDS IV. 615, note 399.
- 188 *Agni Purāṇa*, III. 13.
- 189 *Kūrma Purāṇa*, I. 57. 8-9.
- 190 EI. II. 4.

- 191 Kane: HDS IV. 649.
- 192 Introduction, p. LXXXVI to *Tirthavivechana*.
- 193 *Ibid.*
- 194 *Tirthavivechana*, p. 172.
- 195 *Ibid.* p. 173.
- 196 IA. XV. 63ff.
- 197 Barua, B. M.: *Gayā and Buddha Gayā*, Vol. I. p. 62.
- 198 Sircar, D. C. in *J. Or. Res.*, XVII pp. 209-215.
- 199 EI. II. 330.
- 200 *Tirthavivechana*, pp. 251-253.
- 501 *Ibid.* p. 172.
- 202 JKASB XIV (Letters), no. 1 p. 25.
- 203 *IHQ*. 1952 p. 27.

## CHAPTER XV

### **Standard of Morality**

The standard of morality varies from age to age. It is, therefore, considered unscientific to judge or condemn the manners and customs of one age on the basis of the standard prevalent in an earlier or subsequent age. The digest-writers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. would have condemned as immoral the present-day practices of late marriages for women, their employment in services, trades and professions, the tendency to limit the family circle to husband, wife and children only to the exclusion of others, who were considered worthy of maintenance even under adverse circumstances, and above all, the family-planning devices. We, on our part, consider their system of giving the girls of the age of eight or ten in marriage to young men thrice the age of their spouse, or the permissibility of marrying a second or third wife while the first wife was alive as nothing but immoral. Some would go so far as to suggest that the very large number of Brāhmanas and ascetics, who devoted the whole of their time to religious practices and meditation, were mere drones who did not engage themselves in any productive labour. But apart from such changes in the angle of vision or in social and ethical perspective there are certain principles of ethical conduct which do not change much from country to country or from age to age. These may be called the immutable laws of morality. No one, for example, would suggest that theft, cheating, acceptance of bribe, oppression of the common people can be held up as moral conduct, nor would any one support the unbridled gratification of sexual passion. Keeping these points of view before our eyes, we may make an effort to evaluate the standard of morality as it prevailed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. in Northern India.

So far as the ideals of moral conduct were concerned,



the commentators, *nibandhakāras* and the poets of the age held up before the people the highest code. They all taught the householder to lead a self-restrained and self-sacrificing life for the good of not only their family or country but the whole world, including the inanimate creation. Though such ideals inspired thousands of that age, yet the conduct of a whole people cannot be judged simply by such lofty teachings. We have to examine critically the conduct of kings, courtiers, officers, merchants and other classes of people and also the literary and artistic expressions of the age with a view to arriving at a correct appreciation of the moral standard, actually prevalent on the eve of the conquest of Northern India by the Turko-Afghans.

The *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya prescribes an extremely arduous life for the King. Out of eight parts of the day, as many as six were to be devoted to the affairs of the state, while three out of eight parts of the night were also to be spent on the same.<sup>1</sup> But the *Śukranītisāra*<sup>2</sup> asks the King to devote only eleven out of thirty *muhūrtas* for similar purposes. The *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra* ordains that the King should transact the business of the state for 15 *nādikās* or  $7\frac{1}{2}$  *muhūrtas* only. The rest of his time was to be spent on bath, repast, amusements, playing with beloved ones, twilight worship, dancing, co-habitation and sleep.<sup>3</sup> The *Mānasollāsa* gives us an insight into the actual mode of spending the life by the King. The only time when the King remained engaged in administrative work was while he was holding the Darbar. The elaborate description which Someśvara Chālukya has given about the seating arrangements in his Court shows that it had a more ceremonial than businesslike atmosphere. The ladies of the royal household took their seats by his side and were expected to cast their glance at him from time to time. Not only were all his relatives there, but also the superintendents of wrestling, dancing, bed-making, painting etc.<sup>4</sup> He devotes as many as twenty sections to the various kinds of enjoyment which include elaborate descriptions of food, drinks,

beds, betels, garlands, ornaments, dress, women, etc. Fifteen other sections are devoted to the amusements such as witnessing the fights between wrestlers, cocks, rams, buffaloes, pigeons, dogs, hawks etc. Discussions on poetry, logic and the Śāstras are included amongst amusements. A perusal of this work cannot but leave the impression that the kings in the twelfth century A. D. were steeped in luxury and devoted too much of their time to amusements. In an autocracy the king is the repository of all the powers of the state; and if he does not follow the Aśokan ideal of being ready to hear the complaints of his people at all hours and at all places, power will slip away from his hand to his officers.

### *Immoral Life of the kings:*

To a modern man the kings as well as their court-poets, who composed the laudatory verses for copper-plates and inscriptions, appear to be shameless. They take pride not only in capturing the womenfolk of defeated countries but also in openly proclaiming before the world their dalliance with them. Thus the Bilhari inscription states that the Kalachuri King Yuvarājadeva "fulfilled the ardent wishes of the minds of the women of Gauḍa, who was a deer to sport on those pleasure-hills the breasts of the damsels of Karṇāṭa, (and) ornamented the foreheads of the women of Lāṭa; who engaged in amorous dalliance with the women of Kashmira, (and) who was fond of the charming songs of the women of Kaliṅga".<sup>5</sup> The inscription was written in the time of Yuvarāja II. This sort of brazenfaced proclamation of amorous frivolities is all the more surprising because it was being recorded during the reign of the grandson of Yuvarājadeva I. No other grandson has ever taken such a pride in such escapades of his grand-father. Rājaśekhara states<sup>6</sup> that Yuvarāja married the princesses of Magadha, Malwa, Pāñchāla, Avantī, Jālandhara and Kerala. But even in this extensive network of matrimonial relationships the women of Gauḍa, Karṇāṭa, Kashmīr and Gujarat have no place. Somadeva in his Yaśastilakachampū records

with evident relish that King Maradatta of Rājapura in the Yaudheya country and Yaśodhara, a King of Ujjainī enjoyed the company of women from Andhra, Chola, Valabhī, Kerala, Siṃhala, Karnaṭa, Surāṣṭra, Kamboja, Pallava and Ayodhyā.<sup>7</sup>

The *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* relates a story about Paramardin of Kuntala witnessing a dance by a naked woman—"when the door-keeper announced his (Jagaddeva's) arrival to Paramardin," writes Merutuṅga, "it happened that a low woman was dancing in his court, unclothed save for a flowered petticoat, and at that moment she was seized with shame and snatching up her upper garment, sat down where she was".<sup>8</sup> Dancing by public women not only in royal court but also in the houses of wealthy persons was so much in vogue that Medhātithi in giving examples of royal orders, states: "for so many days dancing girls shall be entertained by all wealthy men".<sup>9</sup>

Stories about the immoral life led by kings of Eastern India in the latter half of the twelfth century are recorded in books written at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Thus Merutuṅga states that Lakṣmaṇasena, having been blinded by passion, "contracted the disgraceful stain of association with a *Mataṅgi*", which means a *Chandāla* woman. Umāpatidhara is said to have written to the King the following verse: "Alas! clinging to the hard-neck of a low-born woman and thereby broken, you have lost, unfortunately, all your state of merit".<sup>10</sup> The same work also states that Jayachandra of Vārāṇasī, took away the wife of a citizen, a lady named Sūhava and made her the chief queen.<sup>11</sup> We find another instance of a married lady going to live with another person though her husband was alive. This was Lavaṇaprasāda's wife Madanarājñī, who went to pay a visit to her brother-in-law's house after the death of her sister, began to live with him as husband and wife. Viradhavala, her son by Lavaṇaprasāda, had also gone there with her, and she bore her new husband two other sons.<sup>12</sup>

Kalhana relates a number of stories regarding the licentious conduct of Kashmirian kings of this period. Thus he writes of the licentiousness of King Kalaśa, who in his youth

had employed a number of low persons to procure for him the wives of others<sup>13</sup> and in his advanced years violated "some of his son's wives, just as (if they were those) of an enemy".<sup>14</sup> The simile used here by the historian shows that it was customary for a victor to enjoy the wives of the vanquished. King Kalaśa finally lost his life "by over-indulgence in sensual pleasures." His son Harṣa (1089-1101) was even more sensual. "His father's wives," writes Kalhaṇa, "who had brought him up on their arms, he took in his arms, kissed them, and continually deported himself with them." He is charged with the violation of the chastity of his sisters too.<sup>15</sup> Utkarṣa and Bhikṣācāra were equally licentious.<sup>16</sup>

Some of the kings of Gujarat also suffered from the same defect. Abhyatīlaka Gaṇi who completed his commentary of Hemachandra's *Dvyāśraya* in VS. 1312 says that Chāmuṇḍarāja (996-1010 A.D.) had loose morals.<sup>17</sup> The custom of keeping dancing girls in the royal court had such a strong hold on the mind of the people of this age that even a great scholar and religious preceptor like Hemachandra writes that his royal disciple Kumārapāla used to be surrounded by a few good dancing girls in his Court.<sup>18</sup> The *Kathāsaritsāgara* relates many stories of the depravities of the kings of this period.<sup>19</sup> The *Hamnāra-mahākāvya* describes how Harirāja, the Chāhamāna king of Ajmer, squandered all his revenues on women and dancing girls. When the generals of Muḥammad of Ghūr attacked his kingdom, he had no other option excepting sacrificing his life on the funeral pyre.<sup>20</sup>

### *Drinking of wine :*

In 851 A.D. Sulaiman found that the Indian princes did not drink wine. He observes "they drink no wine, nor admit vinegar, because it is made of wine and yet they abstain not therefrom a religious duty, but for another reason. They say that if a King is given to wine, he ought not to be deemed a King, for add they, as there are frequent wars with the neighbouring states, how should a drunkard manage the affairs

of his Kingdom"?<sup>21</sup> We notice however a change in the code of morality in this respect in the twelfth century A.D.. The author of the *Śukranītisāra* allows moderate drinking on the ground that it develops talent, sharpens intelligence, increases patience, and makes the mind steady.<sup>22</sup> Lakṣmīdhara prohibits the Brāhmaṇas from drinking spirituous liquors from *gur* or fermented rice or from honey but permits the kings and Vaiśyaś to drink these for vigour or during festivities.<sup>23</sup> The Maithila scholar-statesman Chaṇḍeśvara makes a similar statement.<sup>24</sup> *Mānasollāsa* does not recommend wine-drinking by the King himself, but on the occasion of marriage ceremonies he is to entertain the ladies of the harem with wine. Some of the queens used to take wine habitually; for example, Hemachandra says that Queen Maṇḍalladevi had to give up her drinking habit while Siddharāja was in her womb.<sup>25</sup>

It was customary to offer drinks on occasions like marriage festivities. We find in the *Naiṣadhacharita* that drinks were offered to the persons who accompanied the bride-groom to the bride's house.<sup>26</sup> Some stories in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* suggest that merchants were in the habit of drinking wine.<sup>27</sup> Kalhaṇa informs us that the richer sections of the community used to drink delightful wine flavoured with flowers.<sup>28</sup> The Kashmirian *Nīlamata Purāṇa* permits the drinking of wine on festive occasions.<sup>29</sup> Kṣemendra mentions particularly the festival known as the *Takṣakayātrā*, during which intoxicant liquors were on sale for three days, during all the twenty-four hours.<sup>30</sup> Bilhaṇa in his *Chaurapañchāśikā* depicts the heroine as *madhupāna-raktam* i.e. her face "glowing (ruddy) by drink" during sexual sport (verse 9). Kumārāpāla is known to have made a heroic effort to prohibit not only drinking but also the manufacture of wine jars in Gujarat.<sup>31</sup> It seems that the common people of Gujarat were habituated to drink and that the Jaina King thought it necessary to stop it for moral as well as economic reasons. This inference is supported by the writing of the Arab traveller Al-Mas'ūdī who visited Cambay in the middle of the tenth century A.D..

and observed that "Indians sometimes make girls drink in order to show their mirth so that the beholders may be inspired with gaiety by their merriment".<sup>32</sup>

Had not drinking been widely prevalent, anthologies like *Saduktikarṇāṇṛita*<sup>33</sup>, *Śuktimuktāvalī*<sup>34</sup> *Śārīṅadhara-paddhati*<sup>35</sup> would not have included so many verses on the drinking clubs. Men as well as women are described as having taken part in drinking bouts. Kṣemendra compares a lady with wine in her mouth to Rāhu devouring the moon.<sup>36</sup> A poet describes how a lady having drunk too much of wine faltered on words like "priyā" or 'dear' and 'mukha' or 'mouth', requested her companion to pour down wine into her mouth and when she was found constantly laughing and stumbling she was caught hold of by her friends. Another poem in *Śuktimuktāvalī* says, "An intoxicated girl under the influence of wine is unable to bear the flower, unable to entice her husband by her breath, and the (love-lorn) newly married wife on seeing even the picture of her husband neither drinks, nor sets aside the wine glass." No poet of the present day India would dare to write such a poem as it is simply absurd to imagine newly-married girls taking wine. Śrīharsa draws a pen-picture of another drinking bout: as a result of drunkenness, the fillet is disturbed, the arranged hair is dishevelled, the anklets are producing much greater sound, and due to her frequent movements the necklace seems to be striking her breasts.<sup>38</sup>

### *Suicide:*

Another characteristic feature of the eleventh and twelfth centuries appears to be the prevalence of the practice of committing suicide, specially amongst the ruling classes. Manu and other Dharmaśāstras condemn suicide in severest terms.<sup>39</sup> But the *Mahābhārata* permits one to end his life at a sacred place like Prithūdaka, the holy Himalayas and Prayāga.<sup>40</sup> The *Matsya* and the *Kūrma Purāṇas* extolled the merits of sacrificing one's life in holy places. Lakṣmīdhara quotes exten-

sively from the *Matsya Purāna* and bestows praise upon those who commit suicide by burning themselves at Vārāṇasī or by drawing themselves in the confluence at Prayāga or by leaping from the hills at Amarkaṇṭaka into the Narmadā river to drown themselves.<sup>41</sup> Alberuni also refers to the banyan tree of Prayāga from which Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas threw themselves into the Ganges.<sup>42</sup> He further informs us that persons intending to commit suicide sometimes "hire somebody to drown them in the Ganges keeping them under water till they are dead".<sup>43</sup>

No inscription prior to the eleventh century refers to the suicide of any monarch. But in the period under survey we find several epigraphic and literary records showing princes courting death wilfully. The earliest known case is that of Chaulukya Mūlarāja I, who according to *Dvyāśrayakāvya*, mounted the funeral pyre at Siddhapur on the banks of the river Sarasvatī<sup>44</sup> in 996 A.D. The next case is that of the Chandella King Dhaṅga, who having lived a most useful life for more than one hundred years, courted death at Prayāga while contemplating on Rudra sometime after 1002 A.D.<sup>45</sup> About the same year the Shāhiya King Jayapāla sacrificed his life on the funeral pyre after his repeated defeats at the hands of Sultāns of Ghazni<sup>46</sup>. The Kalachuri King Gāṅgeyadeva along with his one hundred wives committed suicide at Prayāga sometime between 1034 and 1041 A.D.<sup>47</sup> In 1068 A.D. the Chaulukya King Somesvara I Āhavamalla sacrificed his life in the Tuṅgabhadra after performing yogic rites.<sup>48</sup> When the Pāla ruler Rāmapāla heard of the death of his maternal uncle Mathana, who had helped him materially in recovering his kingdom from the Kaivarta rebels, he committed suicide in the Ganges near Monghyr about the year 1120 A.D. Merutunga tells us that when Jayachchandra found that his capital was besieged by the Turko-Afghans, he along with his son by Sūhavadevī, for installing whom on the throne she had invited the invaders, drowned himself in the Ganges in 1194 A.D.<sup>49</sup> According to one school of

interpretation of a verse in *Adbhūtasāgara*, Vallālasena also committed suicide by drowning in the Ganges along with his queen. When suicide at a holy place had come into vogue so much, it is not surprising to find some Kashmir kings dying voluntarily in their own palace. Thus Ananta was stung to the quick by the insults hurled at him by his wife and committed suicide by thrusting a dagger into his anus.<sup>50</sup> Again in 1089 A.D. Utkarṣa being dethroned by Harṣa stabbed himself to death with a pair of scissors.<sup>51</sup>

In previous centuries a few religious fanatics sometimes courted death at some holy places. But even this was not sanctioned by the law-givers, who prescribed retirement to forest hermitage for men above the age of fifty. Handing over the burden of their family to their sons, such persons were advised to lead a quiet life devoted to meditation. Their objective was to subdue the passions and irradicate all desires so that they might be free from the bondage of *Karma* and attain liberation. The *Purāṇas* and the epics describe hundreds of cases in which an old king having bestowed the crown upon the son retired to the forest. It was, however, the characteristic feature of the eleventh and twelfth centuries for the kings to resort to death of their own accord.

Many of the kings like Jayapāla and Jayachandra, Ananta and Utkarṣa found life unbearable; others like Mūlarāja I, Dhaṅga and Gāṅgeyadeva perhaps thought that as they had got all that could be desired in this world, it was better to sacrifice their lives in a holy place so that their happiness might be assured in the after-world. While the former were guilty of escapism, the latter must be held responsible for holding-up a questionable ideal before their subjects.

How pernicious was the social effect of their example can be judged from a few instances of suicide on a mass scale. The *Brāhmaṇas* of Kashmir suffered from a sense of frustration at the frequent rebellions which took place during the reign of Sussala and resorted to solemn fasts, which culmi-



nated in their throwing themselves on fire in every town.<sup>52</sup> Mcrutunga relates that when Vīradhavalā died, as many as one hundred and twenty of his followers elected to burn themselves of their own accord.<sup>53</sup> The prevalence of the *Satī* as well as these instances go to show that life signified little in this age. These instances of suicide are supported by the wealth of information supplied by Maḥmūd Gardizī in his *Kitāb Zain-ul-Akbār*, composed in A.H. 440/1049 A.D. In this portion of the book, which remains even today unpublished, Gardizī observes that "a group of people burn themselves in the following manner. They dig a well near a stream or river. A fire is lit up inside this hollow space and the person, desirous of committing suicide arrives there. This person smearing himself with frankincense, prostrates before the assembly of individuals, and throws himself into the fire. Fire is heaped on him again. After sometime he comes out of it and then rushes to the stream of water, where he remains for such a considerable period that he may die. If he does not die, he again goes inside the fire and coming out of it rushes to the water. He repeats this process till he breathes his last. People believe that if such an individual dies in the fire, lit up in the hollow space below the ground-level, or in the stream or river he would go to paradise.... And some people hit their abdomen with stones till their stomachs burst out and as a result of the opening of intestines, they die.... And some people light fires in four different spots. When a person, seeking death comes there, he stretches his leg towards the head and keeps standing on the other leg in fire till it consumes him... Some of them, throw away the flesh of the thighs and other joints cut off from their bodies, into the fire. While doing these, they recite something from their religious text and the assembled crowd encourage, speak highly of and bless them. They also pray that God, the Honourable and Exalted, may bestow upon those sacrificing personalities the same rank as gods... Some of them place their legs in the fire of cowdung cakes. They

remain in that position till the fires consume them . . Some of them make an oven and the man (who is desirous of committing suicide) sits inside it. Fire is set and the man is burnt therein. People gathering round ask him whether the heaven has descended to him. He replies that it would come to him when he is consumed in the fire and dies . . . Some of them kill themselves by fasting. They do not even drink water. They are called *Anishiyān* (or *Atishiyān* ?). These people die on the twentieth day. Some continue to live till the thirtieth day . . . . To the followers of the *Tarshuliyān* there is a sacred place where the water of the Ganges flows. Here is a big tree, which covers a large area. Underneath the tree, they fix a *tarṣul*, which is made of iron. It is fixed in a perpendicular position . . . . Its upper part has three spires. And these spires are long, thick and sharp . . . . A man (desirous of committing suicide) reads a book under the tree and addresses the river Gaṅgā by saying that either you become bigger (large-hearted ?) or go back and seek the path of heaven, because you come from the midst of paradise and lead the people there . . . . Then the man fixes the perpendicular trident to his body. People remain standing. One amongst the assembled goes up the tree. And then he falls down on him (the person reclining on the spear). Soon the person is shattered to pieces and his body falls in the river. People, who remain standing at the spot, pray for the dead person. They say "he is gone to heaven" . . . . There is another group of people whose custom is that every day they come to a place where the Gaṅgā meets another river Chūn (or Hūn ?). Everyone of this group carries a sharp weapon like sword, dagger etc. If one of these devotees wants to purify himself and seeks nearness to God, the Exalted, he proclaims his desires. The members of his community place garments, ornaments, golden necklaces and bangles and such precious things, on him. They hack that person to pieces with their weapons, they throw half of the body into the river Gaṅgā and the other half into the Chūn. They

say that these two rivers would take him to heaven ... A devotee of another community is followed by a huge crowd, which pray for the former. This person then bids adieu to the assemblage of people and sits in a deserted area. All such birds like vulture, eagle, falcon, hawk, phoenix etc., which prey upon other birds, hover round him. He sits silently. These birds strike him with their beaks and tear off his turban. He heaves no sigh while these birds tear off all his flesh. And he dies in that way. After the birds have eaten all the flesh the members of the community of the deceased personage gather there and every one of them take a piece of the dry bone as a benediction. They burn the bone and keep the ash in their houses. They use these ashes at the time of treating sick persons. These are the introductions of the Hindus which I (the author Gardīzī) could discover." (Ms. Ouseley 240, Page Nos. 260B-262B). Some may construe it as heroic self-sacrifice, but the ennobling ideal of sacrificing one's life for promoting social welfare was hardly visible in any case of suicide in this age.

### *Bribery and Corruption :*

Bribery and corruption are symptoms of bad government. In mediaeval India ministers and other officials were regarded as traditionally open to corruption. Even the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* exhorts the King to protect the subjects from the amātyas and thieves.<sup>54</sup> Kṣemendra in his *Daśavatāracharita* advises the King to remove from office such ministers, generals and priests as are guilty of acceptance of bribes. Otherwise there may be seething resentment amongst the subjects.<sup>55</sup> Lakṣmīdhara emphasises the need of keeping a strict watch on the ministers, as they might prove dangerous to the King as well as to the subjects. Kalhaṇa records several cases of collection of large fortunes by ministers. For example, Bijja became richer than the King by taking recourse to unfair means.<sup>56</sup> Ānanda rose to high office by offering bribes to the King's councillors.<sup>57</sup> The *Śukranītisāra* suggests that

ministers should be selected not on account of their caste and family but because of their merit, character and efficiency in work.<sup>58</sup> He further suggests that they should be transferred from one department to another.<sup>59</sup> Such transfers would minimise risk of bribery and corruption.

If some of the ministers were corrupt, the lower officials like the tax-collectors and writers habitually oppressed the subjects for illegal gratifications. Lakṣmīdhara, with his practical experience of administration, exhorts the king to protect the subjects from the army, thieves, wicked persons and especially the Kāyasthas. He also quotes the views of Manu and Yājñavalkya to that effect.<sup>60</sup> The *Mānasollāsa*<sup>61</sup> and the *Rājjanīratnākara*<sup>62</sup> also express similar views. Kalhaṇa observes that the royal officers, called Kāyasthas are plagues for the people and they are worse than the crabs and white ants. Kṣemendra satirically writes that Rājāsri, having been abducted by the Kāyasthas, sheds tears in the form of ink dropped from their pen.<sup>63</sup> In his *Narmamālā* he recounts their unscrupulousness, hypocritical attitude and their habit of taking bribe and for all these he calls them the "incarnation of the accountant of the *daityas*." From Kalhaṇa we get plenty of evidence supporting these charges. Thus he relates how Chandramukha began his life with a single *cowrie* but having become the king's favourite, he accumulated crores of coins.<sup>64</sup> Bhadrēśvara, an official during the reign of Saṃgrāmarāja, felt no scruples in plundering the treasures of temples.<sup>65</sup> Merutuṅga also records the difficulty which was felt by the monarch in realising the revenue collected by the officials. Sajjana, was appointed as the Governor of Surāṣṭra by Siddharāja Jayasimha, but he misappropriated the revenues collected successively for three years.<sup>66</sup> The tyranny of petty officials must have made the life of the people miserable.

#### *Quacks in medical profession :*

Another source of trouble and affliction in this period was the large number of quacks who played with the life of the

people. Great physicians like Chakrapānidatta, Suresvara Vaṅgasena<sup>67</sup> and Nīśchalakara<sup>68</sup> lived in Bengal during the period. Works like *Rasārṇava* and *Rasādhyāya* were also written in other parts of India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Mrcutuṅga relates how medical experiments were carried on by Vāgbhaṭa, the physician in the Court of Bhoja of Dhārā. He "made use of all the unwholesome things mentioned in the medical treatises, and so produced diseases and then employed to check them the remedies and diets famous in Suśruta and so cured them." In spite of the existence of a galaxy of famous physicians, the country as a whole suffered from a lack of properly qualified medical men. This is why we find that many quacks took up the medical profession. A Kashmir merchant in the reign of Kalaśa acted as a physician to dyers and craftsmen.<sup>69</sup> Kṣemendra in his *Samayamātrikā* presents a brilliant satire on a quack, who is given the epithet of "representative of Yama, the God of Death," and saluted as the destroyer of life of all. He was popular amongst those who were associated with prostitutes. The same writer hints at the fleecing of ministers lying ill for a long time by physicians, as he includes the latter as veritable gold mines for prostitutes. Hemachandra also holds up to ridicule the mercenary character of a physician, who is addressed by a friend as follows: "Your friend may be asking for your help in his sickness, but like a courtesan, if you are not paid, you do not even cast a glance at him".<sup>70</sup> Other contemporary literary works like *Kalāvīlāsa*, and *Narmamālā* of Kṣemendra and *Laṭakamelaka* of Śaṅkha-dhara also refer to quacks and to the low professional etiquette prevailing amongst the physicians of this period. The existence of too many quacks probably led the author of the *Śukranītisāra* to lay down that none should be allowed to practice the medical profession without securing the special permission (license) of the King.<sup>71</sup> This must have been a counsel of perfection, because in an age when the means of communication was ill-developed and the system of government was imperfectly organised it was impossible for the King

to keep an eye on all those who were practising as medical men throughout the country.

### *Merchants :*

In this age the mercantile community in general, failed to live up to the high ideal set up by their predecessors. The merchants of India have received very high praise for their honest and straightforward dealings from foreign travellers. "Their good faith", writes Al Idrīsī, "honesty and fidelity to their engagement are well-known and they are so famous for these qualities that people flock to their country from every side."<sup>72</sup>

But the literary records of the eleventh and twelfth centuries depict the merchants as deceitful hypocrites. Kalhaṇa's description of dishonest merchants, who having embezzled deposits "show themselves ever eager to listen to the (recital of sacred) texts,"<sup>73</sup> cannot but recall to one's mind their modern counterparts, who spend large amounts on getting the holy name of Hari recited by women at Nabadvip and Vrindāvana. The sober historian opines that "courtezans, the official, the clerk and the merchant are deceitful by nature." He further observes, "the merchant, who puts drops of sandal-ointment on the forehead, eye-holes, ears and heart, takes one's life in a moment, just as a dangerous scorpion would, which is marked in six places."<sup>74</sup> The merchants were also the bankers to the people. But declares Kalhaṇa "the water which has been carried down to the ocean by the streams is received (back) from the clouds, but a thing deposited in a merchant's hands is never again recovered."<sup>75</sup> Kṣemendra corroborates the evidence of Kalhaṇa when he writes that merchants become dumb when a person buys only a little quantity of goods and they turn deaf when one comes to recover the mortgaged property from them.<sup>76</sup> Hemachandra, who was familiar with the mercantile community of Gujarat also states that a body free from a disease is as rare as a merchant free from deceitfulness.<sup>77</sup> The *Kathāsaritsāgara* also tells stories about the dishonesty of

merchants.<sup>78</sup> The fall in the standard of morality of merchants reflects an all-round deterioration in the character of the people of the twelfth century A.D.

### *Prostitutes :*

People of North India during the eleventh and twelfth centuries considered prostitution as a normal feature of social organisation. Vātsyāyana regards prostitution as old as human civilization. Every town in mediaeval India had a number of prostitutes. Sandhyākaranandī describes the gay city of Rāmāvātī as "full of joy" also on account of "the youthful heavenly courtezans who had great passion of love and who were dancing passionately while they were wearing their apparels." Vijayapura, the capital of Lakṣmaṇasena, according to Dhoyī, had a large number of beautiful courtezans. Kṣemendra refers to the prostitutes of Mathurā and Śrāvastī in his *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. The same writer gives a highly interesting list of persons whose visit was welcome to the prostitutes as they were like the veritable *kalpa* tree (fulfilling all the desires). These were persons like the only son of a rich man, a young man whose father is dead, an *amātya* or minister of a king, son of a merchant, physician who looks after ailing minister for a long time, son of a famous *guru*, passionate ascetic, irresponsible prince, village official, notable and rich musician, a merchant who is visiting a city for the first time, an erudite scholar and a hard drunkard.<sup>80</sup> The list shows that the clients of courtezans were drawn from all strata of society, not excluding an ascetic or an erudite scholar. Dāmodaragupta's *Kuṭṭanīmata*<sup>81</sup> gives a pen picture of many of these types visiting the public women.

Prof. Gode has shown that the courtezans were experts in the art of painting.<sup>82</sup> Dāmodaragupta depicts them as proficient not only in painting but also in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata, *Kalāśāstra* of Viśvakhila, Book of Music by Dantila, botany, tailoring, magic, instrumental music and the art of cooking.<sup>83</sup> He refers also to rather severe courses of training under teachers of dancing and lyre. Prof. Gode has also

referred to the Puruṣottamapuri plates of King Rāmachandra of Devagiri dated Śaka 1232/1310 A.D. and has come to the conclusion that the status and importance of coutezans declined after the tenth century A.D. This is generally true. - But Merutunga refers to a hetaera-poetess of Gujarat who pleased the Paramāra King Bhoja.<sup>85</sup> He also tells us the story of Chauladevī or Chākuladevī of Pattana, a courtesan who remained faithful to her lover during his long absence.<sup>86</sup> Kumārapāla's great-grandfather was born of this Chauladevī. It may be mentioned in this connection that in spite of his zeal for abolishing adultery, gambling, and slaughter of animals, Kumārapāla did not seek to abolish prostitution. *Mānasollāsa* shows that courtezans continued to be invited to the assembly of poets and scholars convened by the King.<sup>87</sup> From the *Rājadharmakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara, we learn that the old custom of requiring the corporation of courtezans to be present at the time of raising the flagstaff of Indra continued in the twelfth century.

### *Devadāsīs :*

Besides the regular prostitutes, there was another class of women called *devadāsīs*, who were attached to the temples from very old times. They too, were highly proficient in music and dancing. Abu Zeid al Hasan, an Arab traveller who came to India in 867 A.D. writes about them: "In the Indies they have public women called Women of the idol, the origin of whose institution is such : when a woman has laid herself under a vow, that she may have children, if it happens that she brings forth a handsome daughter, she carries the child to the *Bod*, so they call the Idol they worship, and there leave her. When the girl has attained a proper age, she takes an apartment in this public place, and spreads a curtain before her door, and awaits the arrival of strangers as well Indians as men of other sects, to whom this debauchery is made lawful. She prostitutes herself at a certain rate, and delivers her gains into the hands of the Idol's priest, to be



by him disposed of for the use and support of the temple".<sup>88</sup> Alberuni however, records that the income from prostitution in temples used to be taken by the kings for meeting the expenditure of the army.<sup>89</sup> The author of the *Hudūd-ul-ālam*, composed in 928-983 A.D., notes that a temple at Rāmiyān had 30 dancing girls, whose function was to dance round the image.<sup>90</sup> The number of *devadāsīs* seems to have increased much in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. On the authority of *Chau-ju-Kua*, Dr. Ghoshal states that the four thousand temples of Gujarat alone contained more than twenty thousand dancing girls.<sup>91</sup>

Contemporary inscriptions show that *devadāsīs* were associated with the temples of Pradyumneśvara, founded by Vijaya-sena,<sup>92</sup> of Brahmeśvara, founded by the dowager-queen Kolāvatī, the mother of the Somavāṃśī king Uddyotakesarī,<sup>93</sup> of Anantavāsudeva at Bhubaneśvara,<sup>94</sup> of Sobhāneśvara Śiva temple founded by King Vaidyanātha at a place 30 miles south of Cuttack.<sup>95</sup> Not only in the temples founded by monarchs but also in those attached by ascetics, *devadāsīs* were provided. Thus an ascetic named Īśānaśiva arranged for *devadāsīs* in the temple of Śiva erected in the Badaun area in the U. P.<sup>96</sup> Kalhaṇa refers to the *devadāsīs* in the temples of Kashmir<sup>97</sup> and Merutuṅga<sup>98</sup> in the Kumāravihāra in Somnāthapattana. The royal donors of temples and the poets who composed the inscriptions took delight in recounting the physical charms of these *devadāsīs*. Thus Puruṣottama Bhaṭṭa, the composer of the Brahmeśvara temple inscription dated the 18th year of Uddyotakesarī, describes them as girls "whose limbs were adorned with ornaments set in gems and thus appearing as the everlasting but playful lightnings, and who were restless with the weight of loins and breasts and whose eyes were fickle and extended upto the ears and who looked lovely like the pupils of the eyes of men.

Alberuni refers to the opposition of the Brāhmaṇas to the institution of *devadāsīs*.<sup>99</sup> But two inscriptions of Jojālladeva, belonging to the Chāhamāna dynasty of Marwar, dated VS

1147/1090 A.D. show how the kings took steps to overcome all opposition to this system. The two inscriptions record the royal orders to the effect that during the festivals of God Lakṣmaṇasvāmin and others the courtezans attached not only to that particular temple but also of other temples, "must also put on their ornaments and best garments and attend with their *śūlapālas* to celebrate" the festival of dancing, singing, and instrumental music. Jojālladeva solemnly asks his descendants and other princes to keep the festival of all the gods going on in this manner. He further warns them that if any person, be he an ascetic, an old man or a learned scholar, attempt in future to abolish this practice, the reigning monarch must take steps to prevent him from doing so. According to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, the temples were located at Nāḍol.<sup>100</sup> The practice of maintaining *devadāsīs* in temples is at least as old as Kauṭilya;<sup>101</sup> but there was no attempt before the eleventh century A.D. to pool together all the dancing girls attached to all the temples in a particular region with a view to adding to the attraction of each and every religious festival. The adoption of such a procedure bore the risk of transforming religious festivals into mere gay merrymakings, if not something worse.

That such a danger was not imaginary would be apparent from an account of four festivals, during which the people of all classes, young or old, male or female, were asked to give free expression to their pent-up sexual feelings. The first of these festivals is called *Udakasevā-Mahotsava* or *Udasevikā Utsava* by Lakṣmīdhara who gives an elaborate description of it in his *Kṛityakalpataru-Nivatakālakāṇḍa*.<sup>102</sup> The festival is celebrated on the second day after the full moon day of Āśvina. Getting up from the bed early in the morning the people besmeared themselves with mud and moved from house to house like goblins and Rudra. They also brought together their friends and sprinkled mud on them. Men, women and children indiscriminately indulged in indecent pranks, casting to the four winds all sense of shame.\* Drinking wine was

a veritable part of the ceremony. The chief figure of the festival was a person who dressed himself as a Bhairava, besmeared his body with mud and other filthy things and roamed round the village on an ass. Danisels bedecked themselves with fine dress and ornaments and moved about in the streets dancing and singing obscene songs. Merrymakers took the guise of sweepers, cowherds, kings, barbers etc. and the young deputed themselves as old people. Poems were recited by the more refined persons. Lakṣmīdhara quotes the *Skanda Purāṇa* as one of the authorities prescribing this festival. In this *Purāṇa* Śiva is made to justify such saturnalian festival before Pārvatī. † Lakṣmīdhara further quotes the *Brahma Purāṇa* which states that if anybody refuses to participate in this festival out of pride, he will incur the wrath of ghosts and goblins.

The above-mentioned festival bears some similarity to the *Śavarotsava* described by Jīmūtavāhana in his *Kālaviveka*.<sup>103</sup> In it too the people used to cover their bodies with leaves and besmear it with mud and other things in the fashion of the Śavara men. It falls, however, on the Vijayā-daśamī day, that is about a week earlier than the date of *Udakasevā-mahotsava* festival. Dr. R. C. Majumdar and Dr. D. C. Sircar have drawn the attention of scholars to the fact that the two verses quoted by Jīmūtavāhana regarding the manner of its celebration also occur in the *Kālikā-Purāṇa* (61.21-22). Dr. R. C. Majumdar in the *History of Bengal*, Volume I, observes: "It is difficult to believe that the action hinted by the line 'bhaga-liṅga-kṛīyābhiś-cha kṛīḍayeyur-alam janūḥ' was actually practised by the people on this occasion."<sup>104</sup> But Dr. D. C.

\* *Niyatakālakāṇḍam* (GOS ed. p. 412): *Kūmūgni janakairvākyaish trī puṅhlingārtha deśibhiḥ/vāchū paśūchamūcharam kirttayadbhiḥ itastataḥ||*

† *Niyatakālakāṇḍam* (GOS ed. p. 417): *liṅgeṣu hridayam strīnām bhageṣu hridayam nṛīnām/bhaga liṅgārṅgitam sarva, tadīdamjagadaṅgane||*

Sircar says that the two verses "prove that the programme of this festivity included topics on any songs about the sex organs and possibly also about sexual intercourse with requisite movements of the body and that its violation incurred Bhagavati's anger and curse."<sup>105</sup> Chāṇḍeśvara quotes the *Devī Purāṇa* to show that if one does not talk or behave indecently he incurs the wrath of Bhagavati.<sup>106</sup> The fear of incurring the displeasure of the goddesses must have acted as a sort of compulsion on the people to take part in it. But the festival appears to have been a little more restrained than *Udaka-sevā-mahotsava* festival, because the *Bṛhuddharma Purāṇa*<sup>107</sup> which must have been written in mediaeval Bengal states that terms expressive of male and female organs of generation should not be uttered before others except, during the worship of the goddess in the month of Āśvin and that "even then they should never pronounce them before their mothers and daughters and before female disciples who have not yet been initiated to Śakti worship." But Lakṣmīdhara quotes with approval the dictum of the *Skanda Purāṇa*, which says that the *Udasevikā* festival makes those shameless who are habituated to have been ashamed and that the daughter or son does not feel ashamed in the presence of mother, nor a grandson in the presence of the grandfather nor even one's wife of his maternal uncle and vice-versa.<sup>108</sup>

People used to be exceptionally gay also on the occasion of the *Kaumudī-mahotsava*, which was not so much a religious as political festival. It has been described in the *Kṛitya-kalpataru-Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, and not in the *Niyatakālakāṇḍa* by Lakṣmīdhara. On this occasion the houses and shops used to be decorated with flowers and flags and men and women also bedecked themselves with garlands and festive clothes. At night the streets and houses were illuminated with lights. Young men with women were expected to move about in all directions, singing, dancing, laughing and enjoying themselves. Divine

damsels were to dance to the tune of musical instruments.\* The festival was to be concluded with a grand feast for which a number of animals were to be killed so that the Brāhmaṇas might be fed to their hearts' content. If the *Udasevikā* festival and the *Śavarotsava* made use of religious compulsion, this festival had at its back all the forces at the command of the State. It is stated that if a person fails to celebrate the festival according to the rites described above, the King must award him physical punishment. †

The fourth festival in which also there was a free outlet of the sex urges of the people was the *Madanotsava*, which used to be celebrated on the fourteenth day of the bright-half of the month of *Chaitra*. The festival has been referred to in the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, *Mālavīmādhava* of Bhavabhūti, *Kuṭṭanīmata* of Dāmodaragupta and *Yaśastilakachampū* of Somadeva. The last writer, however, gives the thirteenth day of the full moon of *Chaitra* as the date for its celebration. Dāmodaragupta tells us that the festival was eagerly looked forward to by young people as it afforded them a golden opportunity for mixing freely with their beloved ones.<sup>109</sup> Lakṣmīdhara does not refer to any lewd associations of this festival.<sup>110</sup> But Jīmūtavāhana expressly states that with songs and dances people should use indecent words.<sup>111</sup> Chaṇḍeśvara also quotes the same verse.<sup>112</sup> From this it may be concluded that in Eastern India alone the festival had some sexual significance. But two verses from the *Rājamārtanḍa* attributed to Bhoja, show that in other parts of India also the festival was accompanied with sensual amusements.<sup>113</sup>

\*The two verses in (*Rājadharmakāṇḍa*) *Kṛtyakalpataru* Vol. XI. p. 182 (GOS ed.) asking the young men and women and the *Divyayogītaḥ* to move about dancing do not occur in the Udaipur Ms., but are found in the A.S.B., I.O. and other Manuscripts.

† *Rājadharmakāṇḍam* (ed. GOS) p. 183—*yo na kuryādīdamaḥ sarvaṃ puravāsī naraḥ kvachit/pātayettasya śūriram daṇḍam rājā mahā-yaśāḥ*||

The prominence given to such voluptuous practices in the festivals of this period was not an isolated phenomenon. It was a symptom of the decadent society in which religious practices were vitiated by a frank and unabashed addiction to sex. The Tāntrika form of worship, which had its origin in hoary antiquity, became very much popular both amongst the Hindus and the Buddhists in this period. Some of the Hindu Tantras prescribe sexual connection as a part of the religious ceremony. Decency would not allow any quotations from the *Gāndharva-tantra*, *Kāmākṣyātantra*, *Mahāchīnāchākrama*, *Nirvāṇatantra* or *Tantrasūtra* on the grossly sensual rites and revolting practices which have been prescribed as essential features of the Śakti worship. A recent work in Bengali, entitled *Bāṅglār Bāul O' Bāul Gāna* by Prof. Upendranath Bhattacharyya has brought together many such passages from mediæval Tantras.<sup>114</sup> Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya took rather an extremist view in denouncing the later Buddhist cults like *Vajrayāna* and *Kālachakrayāna*. But some of the charges levelled by him against these Buddhists appear to contain a substantial substratum of truth. Thus in course of explaining the contents of *Prajñāpāyavinīśchayasiddhi* of Anaṅgavajra, he writes, "in the fifth chapter the author says that without *Prajñāpāramitā* emancipation is impossible and *Prajñāpāramitā* resides in every woman and by enjoying any woman, whether of low origin or high, or whether mother, sister or other relatives, emancipation can be obtained. In such matters, according to this author, there is absolutely no restriction and without any fear, women may be enjoyed, provided he has been properly initiated by the Guru, for

*Sambhogārthamīdam Sarvaṃ traidhātu kūmaṣeṣataḥ  
Nirmitam Vajranāthena sādhakānām hitāya cha . . .*

It is no wonder that by practising this kind of religion the whole of Eastern India lost all vigour and the whole population became corrupted."<sup>115</sup> on the eve of the Turko-Afghan conquest.

*Adultery :*

Another symptom of moral laxity of this age is the lenient treatment accorded to women guilty of adultery. The punishment which the King according to Manu (VII. 371) was to award to a woman who had intercourse with a man of low caste was to get her devoured by dogs. The ninth century Arab traveller Sulaiman writes: "If any man in the Indies runs away with a woman, and abuses her body, they kill both him and the woman, unless it be proved that she was forced, then the man only is punished with death: but if the woman consented to the evil deed, they are punished with death, both the one and the other".<sup>115a</sup> But Vijñāneśvara, while interpreting Yājñavalkya's dictum (I. 72) that if a woman conceives in adulterous intercourse she should be abandoned, observes that, abandonment does not mean driving her out of the house but only not allowing her to participate in religious acts and inhibiting sexual intercourse with her. He is liberal enough to prescribe that such a guilty wife should be kept apart, guarded in a room and be given food and raiment of inferior quality. Whatever might have been the social effect of such a humane treatment, a modern man cannot but appreciate the generous interpretation of Vijñāneśvara.

*Moral Standard of the Poets :*

The literature of this period also reflects the low moral standard of the people. Poets like Kālidāsa and Amaru describe freely the charms of amorous life indeed, but they seldom indulge in portrayal of the minutest details of co-habitation. Bilhana and Jayadeva, two great poets of this age, however, take special delight in such description. The theme of *Chaurapañchāśikā* of Bilhana is the lament of a lover who contracted a secret union with a King's daughter and having been captured and led to the execution ground, recalls the joys of his amours and according to Keith "the warmth of feelings undoubtedly degenerates into license." In the face of impending death the lover is made to say "I still remember her as

holding the reins in the Tāṇḍava dance of sexual sports, her face beautiful like the full moon, her limbs affected by intoxicated love, she of a slender build, bending on account of the burden of her large breasts and hips, and her (loose) band of hair waving sideways." It may be questioned whether the erotic sentiment does not give way to the fear of death; but the hero of Bilhaṇa preferring death to the pang of separation from his beloved exclaims: "Even now I cannot, for a moment, live by any other way without the sex-enjoyment of that excellent girl. So brothers, death is the only remedy for silencing this craving. I request you, therefore, to speedily cut off (my head)":<sup>116</sup> Some people consider this work as allegorical and treat it as a religious poem.

Jayadeva's *Gītagovinda* is almost universally accepted now as of great mystic and spiritual significance, though its erotic tone is even more pronounced than that of the poem of Bilhaṇa. The remarkable feature of Jayadeva's work is that the poet describes details of sexual love throughout the book and especially in the twelfth canto without the least hesitation, "in a series of extremely brilliant and musical word-pictures." In a pre-Chaitanya commentary of the work, entitled *Sarvāṅgasundarī* and written by Nārāyaṇadāsa, which has been quoted in *Manoramā* composed in 1536 A.D., we find that the verses of Jayadeva are interpreted in the most secular way by quotations from erotic works like *Nāgasaṁvatsara*, written in about the eleventh century A.D. by the Buddhist writer Padmasrijñāna and *Smaradīpikā*. Some of the specially secular poems of Jayadeva on subjects like *ratārambha* and *viparitaratam* have been quoted in *Saduktikarṇāmṛita*. Whatever might have been the feeling of a select coterie of mystics called Rasika regarding the *Gītagovinda*, it evoked erotic sentiment in the large body of the uninitiates among its admirers which the book had all over India.

Lakṣmaṇasena, the patron of Jayadeva and a host of other brilliant poets like Umāpatidhara, Śaraṇa, Govardhanāchārya and



Dhoyī, is not ashamed of recalling his amorous sports with the women of Kaliṅga in his Madhainagar copper-plate.<sup>117</sup> He was himself a poet of no mean order. Eleven of his poems have been quoted in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* and most of them are erotic in character. Govardhanāchārya's *Ārya Saptaśatī* too is full of erotic verses.

### *Sculpture :*

But we find evidence of the most unashamed expression of grossly sensual feelings in the sculptures of Khajuraho and in the Jagannātha temple of Puri. They are definitely vulgar and indecent. O. C. Gangoly in his brilliant paper on the 'Mithuna in Indian art'<sup>118</sup> points out the dictum of the *Agni-Purāṇa* which requires that the doorway of shrines should be decorated with *mithunas*.<sup>119</sup> Dr. Tarapada Bhattacharya in his *Vāstuvidyā* has shown that the injunction can be traced to the *Bṛihatsaṁhitā* of Varāhamihira.<sup>120</sup> But the term *mithuna* means a pair of lovers only, though Gangoly has translated it as "productive couples" in his edition of the *Art of the Chandelas*. It does not necessarily signify *maithuna* or sexual act. O. C. Gangoly has reproduced as many as 33 examples of *mithuna* depicted in sculptures and paintings from the 2nd. century B. C. to the 13th century A.D. Most of these portray a loving couple sitting or standing together. A few represent the lovers in embrace, or a lady sitting on the lap of the lover. Of all the representations of the couples, plate No. 17 of his citation, depicting a couple on the facade of the Durgā temple of Aihole of the sixth century A.D. borders on indecency. Gangoly is forced to concede that "the builder of the Aihole temple, however, did not go to the length of the Orissan artists in picturing his *mithunas*..... We may trace here the germs of the idea which are developed in excessive 'vulgarity' in Orissa and Khajuraho". It may be pointed out in this connection that erotic sculptures are found in the Durgā temple and they may possibly be due to the Tāntric influence. Dr. Niharranjan Ray points out that Sāñchi and Amarāvati knew of *mithuna*

subjects, Mathurā was more than conscious of it, and in the "Ellora scene of Śiva and Pārvatī in rapturous yet self-forgetful kissing embrace, the *mithuna* idea of this *sādhana* finds a most creative expression". But he also notices that whereas in all these examples there was only sensuous suggestiveness, the sculptures of Puri and Konārak depict "sexual acts in the widest possible varieties of poses and attitudes known to the *Kāmasāstras*."<sup>121</sup>

Chronologically speaking the Aihole temple couples are followed by the indecent sculptures in the Rājārāṇī temple of Bhuvaneśvara. This temple has been ascribed to the tenth century A.D. The Khajuraho sculptures come next in point of time. The Kandariya temple, the Chitrāgupta temple and a few other temples at Khajuraho present a large number of couples engaged in actual sexual act. They seem to have been carved with a view to illustrating the sexual postures described in books of erotics like *Kāmasūtra* and *Nāgara-sarvasva*. O. C. Gangoly in his recent description in *The Art of the Chandelas* observes "some of the panels on the Khajuraho temple appear to illustrate these physical postures not strictly called forth by the direction to depict *mithunas* as sacred symbols. This may be a piece of misapprehension and unconscious piece of exaggeration or a wrong or misguided interpretation of the *śilpa-śāstra*."<sup>122</sup>

But he has ignored the working of the forces of Tāntricism which were making themselves perceptible in the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D. Under some such influence Bhoja at the beginning of the eleventh century expanded the simple canon for depicting *mithunas* into an elaborate rule for presenting figures engaged in reproductive activity. In his *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra* he writes :

*Ratikriḍāparā nāryyo nāyakastu yādrichchhayā*

*Kimchit pratanubhir gūtrairiḥ kāryaḥ suratalūlasaḥ.*<sup>123</sup>

It means that the woman should be depicted as fully engaged in sexual intercourse and the lover, on the other hand, if so

desired, may be shown as desirous of sex play with slightly slim bodies. Some such new canon must have inspired the sculptors of the Rājārāṇī temple of Bhuvaneśvara in the tenth century as well as the Kandariya temple at Khajuraho in the eleventh and the Jagannātha temple at Puri in the twelfth century A.D. Some other pieces of sculptures belonging to the same period were engraved under similar influence in Bihar. The door-frame discovered at Belwa, district Saran (c. 1000 A.D.) and kept in the Patna Museum, has got two representations of *mithunas* in embrace. There is another set of two representations of "man-woman" in embrace in a relief on a door frame lying among the ruins of the temples of Śiva and Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa at Bhagawanpur in the district of Darbhanga. According to an inscription inscribed on the pedestal of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa, the image belonged to Malladeva, son of Nānyadeva and younger brother of Saṅgadeva who ruled from 1134 A.D. to 1148 A.D.<sup>121</sup>

O. C. Gangoly suggests that as the canons of *Śilpaśāstras* advise the selection of such sites for temples as have been sanctified by the love of couples, human or animal, and as such sites were not available, "the artists sought to remedy the defect by picturing on the shrines the effigies of loving couples."<sup>122</sup> Dr. Tarapada Bhattacharya also quotes a passage from the *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra* (VIII. 43) stating that the site selected should be "*mithunānām ratipradah*".<sup>126</sup> But it must be conceded that none of these texts make it imperative to go to the length which the artists of Khajuraho and Puri did go. The *Pāṇḍās* of the Puri temple say that the obscene sculptures have been placed with a view to protecting the temple-building from thunder. Such an explanation must have been improvised in the Tāntrik-ridden Orissa of the twelfth century A.D. The beautiful and much more ancient pagodas of Mahābalipuram have absolutely no *mithuna* figure and yet they have not been struck by thunder. Rothenstein rightly observes: "An element of wantonness does undoubtedly assert itself in art, and we must envisage certain aspects of

mediaeval carving as a part of Tāntric attitude which was characteristic of Indian religious philosophy between the tenth and twelfth centuries." The indecent sculptures of Khajuraho and Puri are all the more objectionable because they have been engraved on the holy temples. These temples were visited not only by the old people in their senile decay but also by thousands of young men and women whose passions could be easily stirred by such scenes. The disastrous consequences of a total absence of control over sexual exuberance as depicted in these temples have been seen again and again in human history.

Marco Polo (C. 1293 A.D.) describes the naked ascetics of Gujarat who ate nothing but a little rice and milk and lived upto an age of 150 or 200 years. He says that those who were inured to the temptations of the flesh were allowed to enter their order and that when a novice sought admission, they had him properly put to the test by getting the temple girls to try their blandishments on him. But all the same there were many sensual men who wriggled into the fold for the tune of an easy life. Some of these ascetics must have been caricatured in the erotic scenes depicted on the Bhuvanesvara, Puri and Konarak temples in which "the male figure is that of an ascetic with a head shaved all over and a ring of beads in one hand".<sup>127</sup>

We are not oblivious of the fact that there were hundreds and thousands of people in Northern India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, who were inspired by the ideals of compassion, liberality, truth, purity, gentleness, peace, bliss, saintliness and self-control as preached in the *Dharmaśāstras*. But they worked for their individual salvation without making any earnest effort to improve the moral tone of their contemporary society. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D., we do not find any dynamic personality like Śaṅkara or Rāmānuja, who lived at Kanchipura and settled at Srirangam, in Southern India.

## REFERENCES TO CHAPTER XV

## (Standard of Morality)

- 1 Kauṭilya I. 19.
- 2 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.) I. 276-285.
- 3 *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra* I. 59-60.
- 4 *Mānasallāsa*, (GOS. Vol 84, pp. 104-105) *viṃśati* 3, 11.
- 5 DHNI. II. p. 760.
- 6 *Viddhaśālabhaṇjikā* Act. IV.
- 7 *Yasastilakachampū* pp. 21-22, 33.
- 8 *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tr. Tawney) p. 186.
- 9 Manu VII, 13 (Tr. Jha)
- 10 *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tawney) p. 181.
- 11 *Ibid.* pp. 183-185.
- 12 *Ibid.* p. 154 (ed. *Singhi Jain Series*, p. 98).
- 13 RT. VII. 304-306.
- 14 *Ibid.* VII. 684.
- 15 *Ibid.* VII. 1147-1148.
- 16 *Ibid.* VII. 850, 889.
- 17 Commentary on DV. VII. 30.
- 18 *Ibid.* VI. 38.
- 19 *Kathāsaritsūgara* (Tr. Tawney) I. 289, II. 490.
- 20 *Hamnūramahākāvya* IA. VIII 1879 p. 62.
- 21 *Ancient Accounts of India and China* by two Mahommedan travellers who went to these parts in the Ninth Century (translated into English by Renaudot, London 1733) p. 33.
- 22 *Śukranītisāra* (ed. Cal.) I. 116-117.
- 23 *Niyata*. p. 331.
- 24 *Grihastharatnākara* p. 394.
- 25 DV. I. 13.
- 26 *Naiṣadhacharita*, Canto XVI. 99.
- 27 *Kathāsaritsūgara* story LIV. 170 ff.
- 28 RT. VIII. 1866-67.
- 29 *Nilamata Purāṇa* (ed. De Vrecse) verses 450-53.
- 30 *Samayamātrikā* II. 88.
- 31 Majumdar, A. K : *Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, pp. 344, 355.
- 32 Nainar: *Arab Geographers' Knowledge of Southern India*, p. 102.
- 33 *Sadukti*. p. 148 (edition of R. Sharma and H. D. Sharma).
- 34 *Suktimuktāvalī*, pp. 266-67.
- 35 Sp. verses 3647-3653.
- 36 *Ibid.* p. 543 and also *Suktimuktāvalī*, p. 267.
- 37 *Ibid.* p. 544 and p. 266.
- 38 *Suktimuktāvalī*, p. 266.
- 39 Manu V. 89; Parāśara IV. 1-2.
- 40 HDS. II. p. 925.

- 41 *Tīrthavivechana.*, pp. 21, 138-139, 142-146, 200.
- 42 Sachau II. 170-171.
- 43 *Ibid.* II. p. 170.
- 44 DV. VI. verses 100-107, IA. IV. 111. A different version is given in the *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tr. Tawney. p. 29).
- 45 EI. I. 14.
- 46 DHNI. I. p. 87.
- 47 EI. II. 4, XII. 211, XXI. 94; JASB. XXI. 116.
- 48 EC. II, SK. 136.
- 49 *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tr. Tawney, pp. 185-186), (Tr. Dvivedi, pp. 140-141).
- 50 RT. VII. 441-447.
- 51 *Ibid.* VII. 852.
- 52 *Ibid.* VIII. 658.
- 53 *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tr. Tawney p. 167).
- 54 *Bhāgavata* 4. 14. 17.
- 55 *Dāśūvatāracharita* (KM) canto X. 14.
- 56 RT. VII 547, 555.
- 57 *Ibid.* VII. 993-995.
- 58 *Sukranītisūtra* II. 54-55 (ed. Cal.).
- 59 *Ibid.* II. 107-115.
- 60 *Rāj.* p. 83.
- 61 *Mānasollāsa* (GOS. Vol. 28, p. 4?) *Viṃśatī* II. 155-156.
- 62 *Rājanītiratnākara*, p. 54.
- 63 *Kalāvīlāsa*, verse 7.
- 64 RT. VII. 112.
- 65 *Ibid.* VII. 43.
- 66 *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tawney) p. 96.
- 67 IC. III. 156-59, HB I 316-318, *Struggle for Empire*, p. 328.
- 68 *IHQ.* XXIII 127-134.
- 69 RT. VII 282.
- 70 *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacharita* I. i, V. 533; also Majumdar, A. K. : *Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, p. 339.
- 71 *Sukranītisūtra* I 304 (p. 73).
- 72 HIED Vol. I. p. 88. Cf. also Marco Polo (ed. Yule, p. 313)
- 73 RT. VIII 706-710.
- 74 *Ibid.* VIII 131, 133.
- 75 *Ibid.* VIII 128.
- 76 *Samayamūtrikā* V. 53-58.
- 77 *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacharita* cited by A. K. Majumdar, p. 339.
- 78 *Kathāsaritsāgara* II. p. 3.
- 79 RC. III. 37.
- 80 *Samayamūtrikā* V. 63-67.
- 81 *Kuṭṭanīmatam* (ed. Ray, T. N.) verses 392-403.
- 82 ABORI 1941, pp. 25-34.
- 83 *Kuṭṭanīmatam*, verses 123-125 and also 346 and 355.

- 84 ABORI XXII p. 35.
- 85 *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Tawney), p. 67.
- 86 *Ibid.* Ch. IV p. 93.
- 87 *Mūnasollāsa* II p. 155.
- 88 *Ancient Accounts of India and China* (1733 ed). *Op. cit* p. 88.
- 89 Sachau II 157.
- 90 PIHC 1939, p. 667.
- 91 *The Struggle for Empire*, pp. 495-96.
- 92 EI. I. p. 310 verse 30.
- 93 JRASB XIII (1947), p. 71.
- 94 EI. VI. pp. 198-205, verse 25.
- 95 JBORS 1931, Vol. XVII p. 124.
- 96 EI. I. pp. 61-66, verse 17.
- 97 RT. VII 858.
- 98 *Prabandhachintāmaṇi* (Singhi Jain), p. 108.
- 99 Sachau II 57.
- 100 EI. XI. p. 26. 101 Kautilya II. 23.
- 102 *Kṛtyakalpataru - Niyatakālakāṇḍam*, pp. 411-419.
- 103 KV. (Bib. Ind. ed). p. 514.
- 104 HB. I. 606.
- 105 JRASB (1948). XIV. i. pp. 105-106.
- 106 *Kṛtyaratnākara*, p. 362.
- 107 *Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa* III. 6. 81-83.
- 108 *Niyatakālakāṇḍam*, p. 418.
- 109 *Kuṭṭānimatam* (ed. Tridibnath Ray), p. 194 verse 892
- 110 *Niyatakālakāṇḍam* pp. 384-85.
- 111 *Kālaviveka*, p. 470.
- 112 *Kṛtyaratnākara*, p. 138.
- 113 Verses 237 and 238 quoted in ABORI 1936 p.p 333-334.
- 114 *Bāṅglār Bāul O' Bāul Gāna*, pp. 456-461, 465-468.
- 115 *Proceedings of 3rd Oriental conf.*, Madras 1925 pp. 139-140.
- 115a *Ancient Accounts of India and China*, *Op. cit.* p. 34.
- 116 *Chaurapañchāśikā* (S. N. Tadpatrikar's ed. and translation),  
verse nos. 7 and 49.
- 117 JASB (New Series) V. p. 473.
- 118 *Rūpam*, April-July, 1925 pp. 54-61.
- 119 *Agni Purāṇa*, ch. 105. 30 (Bib. Ind. ed.)
- 120 Bhattacharya, Tarapada: *Vāstuvidyā*, p. 230.
- 121 *The Struggle for Empire*, p. 653.
- 122 *The Art of the Chandelas*, p. 30.
- 123 *Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra*, XXXIV 33-34.
- 124 PIHC. Patna Session, 1946 p. 179.
- 125 *Rūpam*, April-July, 1925 p. 61.
- 126 *Rūpam*, January 1926 p. 23.
- 127 Bhattacharya, Tarapada: *Vāstuvidyā*, p. 233.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Original Sources (Literary Texts and Translations):

- Agni Purāṇa*—Edited by Panchanan Tarkaratna, pub: Vangavasi Press, Calcutta.
- Aparārka*—Commentary on *Yājñavalkya-smṛiti* (Anandasrama Sanskrit Series).
- Āpastamba-dharmasūtra*—with commentary of Haradatta, edited by Halasyanathasastrī, Kumbakonam.
- Āpastamba-grihyasūtra*—with commentary of Sudarśanāchārya, pub: Mysore Government Central Library Series.
- Arisimha*—*Sukṛitasamkīrtana*, JASS. Bhavnagar, 1917.
- Āśvalāyana-grihyasūtra*—with commentary of Nārāyaṇa, pub: NSP or Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay, 1894.
- Āśvalāyana-śrautasūtra*—Pub: BI, 1879.
- Bānabhaṭṭa*—*Harṣacharita*, Trans. by E. B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas, London.
- Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra*—Edited by F. W. Thomas, Lahore, 1921.
- Baudhāyana-dharmasūtra*—Pub: Anandasrama Sanskrit Series.
- Bhāgavata*—Edited by Dhananjaya Das, Pub: Chakravartti and Chatterjee, B. S. 1345.
- Bhaktiratnākara*—by Narahari Chakravarti.
- Bharata*—*Nāṭyaśāstra*, with commentary of Abhinava-gupta, GOS or Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda, Vol. Nos. 36 and 68.
- Bhavadevabhaṭṭa*—*Prāyaścitta-prakaraṇa*, edited by Girisa Chandra Vedantatirtha, pub: VRS or Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, 1927.
- Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa*—Published by Kṣemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa, Venkatesvara Press, Bombay.
- Bhoja*—*Rājamārtaṇḍa* (Kane in ABORI or Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Poona (Vol. XXXVI).



- Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*, edited by T. Ganapati Shastri (GOS. VOL. Nos. XXV and XXXII).
- Yuktikalpataru*, edited by Isvarachandra Sastri, pub : Calcutta Oriental Series, Calcutta 1917.
- Bilhaṇa—*Chaurapañchāśikā*, edited by S. N. Tadpatrikara, pub : Oriental Book Agency, 1946.
- Karṇasundari*, edited by Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab, pub : NSP. 1888.
- Vikramāṅkadevacharita*, edited by G. Bühler, pub : BSS or Bombay Sanskrit (and Prakrit) Series, Bombay (and Poona).
- Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa*—Edited by Jivananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1888.
- Brihaddharma Purāṇa*—Edited by Mm. Haraprasad Shastri, pub. BI or Bibliotheca Indica. Calcutta, 1897.
- Brihannārādīya Purāṇa*—Edited by Panchanan Tarkaratna, Pub : Vangavasi Press, Calcutta, B. S. 1316.
- Brihaspati-smṛiti*—Trans. Jolly, Pub : SBE or Sacred Books of the East, Oxford, 1889.
- Chānd Bardāi—*Prithvīrāja-rāso*, edited by M. V. Pandia and Shamsundar Das, Banaras, 1913.
- Chāṇḍeśvara—*Grihasīharatnākara*, pub : BI. *Kṛtyaratnākara*, Pub : BI, 1925 and edited by Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛititirtha.
- Rājanīratnākara*, edited by K. P. Jayaswal, pub : Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna, 1936.
- Vivādaratnākara*, pub : BI.
- Dāmodaragupta—*Kuṭṭanāmata*, edited and translated into Bengali by Tridib Nath Ray, Pub : Vasumati, B. S. 1360.
- Devalasmṛiti*—Pub : ASS or Anandasrama Sanskrit Series, Poona ; Trans. by M. N. Ray in JBORS, 1927.
- Devanṇabhaṭṭa—*Smṛitichandrikā*, edited by L. Srinivasacharya and pub : Government of Mysore, Mysore : edited by J. R. Gharpure, Bombay, 1918.
- Dhoyī—*Pavanadūta*, edited by Chintaharan Chakravarti, pub : Sanskrit Sahitya Parisat, Calcutta, 1926.

*Gautama-dharmasūtra*—with the commentary of Haradatta, pub: ASS, 1910.

Gopālabhaṭṭa—*Haribhaktivilāsa*, with commentary of Jīva Goswami, pub: Ramnarayana Vidyaratna, Murshidabad, B. S. 1289.

Govardhana—*Āryāsaptasatī*, pub: NSP, 1895.

Halāyudha—*Abhidhānaratnamālā*, edited by Th. Aufrecht.

Harṣa—*Priyadarśikā*, edited by V. D. Gadre, Bombay 1884.

Hemachandra—*Abhidhānachintāmaṇi*, edited by Hargovinddas Bechardas and Muni Jinavijayji, Bhavnagar, 1914, 1919.

*Deśināmamālā*, edited by R. Pischel, second edition by P. V. Ramanujasvami, pub: BORI or Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1938.

*Dvyāśrayakāvya*, edited by A. V. Kathvate, pub: BSS, Vol. Nos. 69 and 76.

Prākṛit *Dvyāśraya* or *Kumārapālacharita* (cantos XXI-XXVIII) Second edition revised by P. L. Vaidya BORI, Poona, 1936; extracts published in IA.IV. 72 ff. *Laghvarhannītiśāstra*, Ahmedabad, 1906,

*Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacharita*, Translation by Johnson (GOS. Vol. nos. LI, LXXVII, CVIII and CXXV).

Hemādri—*Chaturvarga-chintāmaṇi*, Vol. II. (Vratākhaṇḍa) Part I, edited by Pt. Bharatachandra Siromani Pub: BI; Part II. edited by Pt. Yajnesvara Bhattacharya and Pt. Kamakhyanatha Tarkaratna, pub: BI, Calcutta 1878-1879.

Īśānaśivagurudeva Misra—*Īśānaśivagurudeva-paddhati*, edited by T. Ganapati Sastri in 4 volumes (Trivandrum 1920-1925).

Jayadeva—*Gītagovinda*, edited by H. Mukhopadhyaya.

Jayadratha—*Haracharitchintāmaṇi* (KM or Kavyamala, NSP, Vol. No. 61).

Jayānaka.—*Prithvirājaviṣaya*, with commentary by Jonarāja, edited by S. K. Belvalkar, pub. BI; Extracts in JRAS, 1913, pp. 259 ff.

Jayasim̃hasūri—*Hammīramadamardana*, edited by C. D. Dalal (GOS. Vol. No. X).

Jalhaṇa—*Śuktimuktāvalī*, edited by E. Krishnamacharya, pub. GOS. Vol. No. 82).

*Mugdhopadeśa*, Pub. KM. Vol. No. VIII.

Jimūtavāhana—*Dāyabhāga*, Trans. by H. T. Colebrooke, Calcutta 1910; Bengali trans. by Chandicharan Smritibhusana, second edition, Calcutta B. S. 1316.

*Kālaviveka*, edited by Madhusudana Smritiratna and Pramathanatha Tarkabhusana, Pub: BI. 1905.

*Vyavahāramātrikā*, edited by Asutosh Mookerjee MASB or Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.

Jonarāja—*Dvītīya-rājatarāṅgiṇī*, edited by P. Peterson, Pub. BSS. 1896.

Kalhaṇa—*Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, English translation with an introduction, commentary and appendices by M. A. Stein, Westminster, 1900.

Kamalākarabhaṭṭa.—*Śūdrakamalākara*, pub. NSP. 4th edition.

Kāmandaka—*Nītisāra*, edited by R. Mitra, Pub. BI, 1884.

*Kātyāyanasmṛiti*—Translation by P. V. Kane.

Kauṭilya—*Arthaśāstra*, original text and translation by R. Shamasastri.

Kṛṣṇamiśra—*Prabodhachandrodaya*, pub. NSP, Bombay, 1904.

Kṣemendra—*Darpadalana*, pub. KM. VI.

*Daśavatāracharita*, edited by Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab, KM. 26.

*Deśopadeśa* and *Narmamālā*, edited by M. Kaul, Poona, 1923.

*Kalāvīlāsa*, pub. KM. I.

*Samayamātrikā* pub: KM X

*Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, translation in Bengali by Sarachchandra Das, pub: Vangiya Sahitya Parisat, BS. 1319-1322.

*Nītikalpataru*, edited by V. P. Mahajan, pub: BORI, Poona, 1936.

- Kṣīrasvāmin**—*Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*, edited by K. G. Oka, Poona, 1913.
- Kūrma Purāṇa**—edited by Panchanan Tarkaratna, pub. Vangavasi Press, second edition, Calcutta BS. 1332.
- Lakṣmīdhara**—*Kṛityakalpataru*, edited with an introduction by K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, pub. GOS.
- Brahmachūrikāṇḍa*, Vol. I. (GOS. No. CVI), 1948.
- Dānakāṇḍa*, Vol. V. (GOS. No. XCII), 1941.
- Grihasthakāṇḍa*, Vol. II. (GOS. No. CI.), 1944.
- Niyatakūlakāṇḍa*, Vol. III. (GOS. No. CXI), 1950.
- Rājadharmakāṇḍa*, Vol. XI. (GOS. No. C), 1944.
- Śuddhikāṇḍa*, Vol. X. (GOS. No. CXII), 1950.
- Tīrthavivechanakāṇḍa*, Vol. VIII. (GOS. No. XCVIII), 1942.
- Vratākāṇḍa*, Vol. IX. (GOS. No. CXXX), 1953.
- Lekhāpaddhati**—edited by C. D. Dalal and G. K. Shrigondekar pub: GOS. No. XIX. 1925.
- Mahābhārata**—with commentary of Nīlakaṇṭha.
- Mañkha**—*Śrīkaṇṭhacharita*, edited by Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab.
- Manusmṛiti**—with Kullūkabhaṭṭa's commentary, pub. NSP.
- with Medhātithi's commentary, edited by Ganganatha Jha, pub: Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta 1932.
- Matsya Purāṇa**—ASS publication, 1907; Vangavasi Press, BS. 1316.
- Medinīkośa**.—Calcutta, 1884.
- Merutuṅga**—*Prabandhachintāmaṇi*, translation in English by C. H. Tawney, pub. BI; Hindi edition edited by Muni Jinavijaya and trans. by H. P. Dwivedi (pub. Singhi Jain Series No. 1, 1933).
- Mitramiśra**—*Vīramitrodaya*, sections entitled *Rājanītiprakāśa* and *Sanskāraprakāśa*, pub: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.
- Nārada-smṛiti**—edited by Jolly (SBE. XXXIII, part I).
- Nayachandra Sūri**—*Hammīramahākāvya*, edited by N. J. Kirtane; Extract in IA. VIII, pp. 55-73.

**Nilakaṇṭha—*Dānamayūkha***, pub. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.

***Nilamata Purāṇa***—edited by De. Vreese ; edited in Lahore, 1924 (Leiden, 1936).

***Nītiprakāśikā***—edited by Oppert, Madras 1882.

**Padmagupta—*Navasāhasāṅkacharita***, edited by V. S. Islam-purkar, pub: BSS, 1895.

***Padma Purāṇa***—ASS, 1893.

**Pāṇini—*Aṣṭādhyāyī***, pub: NSP, 1929.

**Prabhāchandra—*Prabhāvakacharita***, edited by H. M. Sharma. Also pub: Singhi Jain Series, No. X, Ahmedabad, 1940.

**Prahlādanadeva—*Pārthaparākramavyāyoga***, pub: GOS. Vol. IV.

***Prithvīrājaviṇaya***—JRAS, 1913, pp. 259 ff.

***Purāṇanaprabandhasaṁgraha***—edited by Jinavijaya Muni, pub: Singhi Jain Series, No. 2, Calcutta 1936.

**Puruṣottama—*Trikāṇḍaśeṣa***, edited with a commentary by C. A. Seelakkhandha, Bombay, 1916.

***Rāmāyaṇa***—Translation in English by M. N. Dutt, Calcutta 1892-1894 ; edition of Madras Law Journal Office, 1933.

**Rudradhara—*Varṣakṛityam***, edited by Ramachandra Jha.

***Sādhanamālā***—edited by B. Bhattacharyya (GOS. Vol. Nos. 26 and 41), 1925 and 1928.

**Sandhyākaranandī—*Rāmacharita***, edited by R. C. Majumdar, R. G. Basak and N. G. Banerji, Rajshahi, 1939.

**Śaṅkhadhara Kavirāja—*Laṭakamelaka***, edited by Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab, pub: NSP (KM No. 20), 1923.

***Śārṅgadhara-paddhati***—edited by P. Peterson, pub: BSS. No. XXXVII.

**Śatānanda—*Bhāsvatī***.

***Śātātapa-smṛiti***—ASS Publication.

***Śiva Purāṇa***—edited by Panchanan Tarkaratna, pub: Vangabasi Press.

***Skanda Purāṇa***—Venkatesvara Press publication.

- Smṛiti-sandarbhah*—In three volumes, pub: Gurumandaḥ Granthamālā, Calcutta, 1952.
- Soḍḍhala—*Udayasundarikathā*, edited by C. D. Dalal and E. Krishnamacharya (GOS. Vol. No. XI).
- Somadeva—*Nītivākyāmṛita*, pub: Manikchand Granthamālā Series No. 22.
- Yaśastilaka*, edited by Pt. Sivadatta, pub. NSP.
- Somadeva—*Kathāsaritsāgara*, translation in English by C. H. Tawney; edited by Penzer as the Ocean of Story in ten volumes.
- Somaprabhāchārya—*Kumārapālpratibodha*, edited by Munī Jinavijayaji, (GOS. Vol. No. XIV).
- Someśvara—*Kīrtikaumudī*, edited by A. V. Kathvate, pub: BSS. No. XXV.
- Someśvara—*Mānasollāsa* (Abhilaṣitārthachintāmaṇi), edited by G. K. Shrigondekar (GOS. Vol. Nos. 28 and 84)
- Śrīdhara—*Smṛityarthasāra*, edited by Ranganatha Sastri Vaidya; ASS publication.
- Śrīdharadāsa—*Saduktikarṇāmṛita*, edited by R. Sharma, with introduction by Dr. Har Dutt Sharma and P. S. Sharma, pub: Motilal Banarsi Dass, Punjab Oriental Series, No. XV, Lahore 1933.
- Śrīharṣa—*Naiṣadhacharita*, translated into English by K. K. Handiqui, pub: Motilal Banarsidass, Lahore, 1934.
- Śukra—*Śukranītisāra*, edited by Jivananda Vidyasagara Translated into English by B. K. Sarkar, pub: Panini Office, Allahabad 1914.
- Udayaprabhasūri—*Śukritakīrtikallolīnī*, edited by C. D. Dalal, (GOS. Vol. No. X)
- Vāchaspati Miśra—*Tīrthachintāmaṇi*, edited by Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛititirtha, pub: BI. 1912.
- Vaikhānasa-smārta-sūtra*—edited with English translation by Dr. Caland.
- Vallālasena—*Dānasāgara*, edited by Bhabatosh Bhattacharyya, in three fasciculus, pub: BI. No. 274, 1953-55.
- Varāha Purāṇa*—BI. publication.

- Varāhamihira**—*Bṛihatsaṃhitā*, translated into English by S. Sastri and M. Ramakṛṣṇa Bhat, Bangalore, 1947 and also translated by N. C. Iyer, Madura, 1884
- Vātsyāyana**—*Kāmasūtra*, pub: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.
- Vijñāneśvara**—*Mitākṣarā*, pub: NSP. 1926
- Viṣṇudharmottara**—Venkatesvara Press Publication.
- Viśvarūpa**—Commentary on *Yājñavalkya*, edited by T. Ganapati Sastri, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, Vol. No. LXXIV, 1912.
- Yādavaprakāśa**—*Vaijayanī*, edited by G. Oppert, Madras.
- Yājñavalkyasmṛiti**—edited by J. R. Gharpure, Bombay, 1936.
- Yaśaschandra**—*Mudritakumudachandra*, pub: Jaina Yasovijaya Granthamālā Series No. VIII, Banaras, 1906.
- Yaśahpāla**—*Moharājaparājaya*, edited by Muni Chaturvijaya (GOS. Vol. No. IX)

(ii) *Literary Texts and Translations of Persian and Arabic Works.*

- Āin-i-Akbarī* of Abū'l Fazl—English translation (Vol. II) by H. S. Jarrett, pub, BI, Calcutta.
- Hudūd-ul-Ālam*—India as described by an unknown Geographer of the 10th century, published in Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Calcutta Session, 1939.
- Kitāb-ul-Hind* of Al-Bīrūnī—English translation (Alberuni's India) by E. C. Sachau, two volumes in one, pub: Trubner Oriental Series, London, 1914.
- Kitāb Zain-ul-Akhhār* of Abu Said Hayy bin ad-Dahhak b. Mahmūd Girdīzī (c. 440 A. H.)—Photostat copy of Ms. Ouseley MS. 240 from Bodelian library, Oxford, page Nos. 213B-220B, 246B-262B. This manuscript was copied in 1196 A. H.
- Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī* of Minhāj-ud-dīn b. Sirāju-ud-dīn—English translation by B. De, pub: BI, Calcutta 1913-1940.
- Ta'rīkh-i-Firishta* of Muhammad Qāsim Firishta.—English translation by Lt. Col. J. Briggs, Reprint, Calcutta 1908.

*Ta'rikh-i-Yamīnī* of Al-'Utbi—English Translation by J. Reynolds.

Elliot, H. M. and Dowson, John—*History of India as told by its own Historians*, Volumes I-III utilised.

Volume II reprinted with introduction by M. Habib, commentary by S. H. Hodivala and supplement by K. A. Nizami, pub: Cosmopolitan publishers, Aligarh, 1952.

Hodivala, S. H.—*Studies in Indo Muslim History*, Bombay, 1939.

Renaudot, E.—*Ancient Accounts of India and China by two Mohammedan Travellers*, London 1733. (The travellers were Sulaiman and Abu Zeid).

### (iii) Tibetan

Tāranātha—English Translation (History of Buddhism in India) by U. N. Ghoshal and N. Dutt published in IHQ. Volumes III, IV, V-VIII, X, XXVII and XXVIII. Extracts translated into English and published by W. L. Heeley in IA. IV. 101 ff.

### (iv) Inscriptions.

Bhandarkar, D. R.—*List of Inscriptions of Northern India*, Appendix to EI. XIX, XXIII.

Fleet, J. F.—*Gupta Inscriptions* (or *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III).

Maitreya, A. K.—*Gaudalekhamālā*, Rajshahi, B. S. 1319.

Majumdar, N. G.—*Inscriptions of Bengal*, Vol. III.

Sircar, D. C.—*Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I, Calcutta University, 1942.

Also *A Collection of Prakrit and Sanskrit Incrptions*, published by the Bhavnagar Archaeological Department, *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India*, *Annual Report of the Rajputana Museum*, *Epigraphia Indica*, *Indian Historical Quarterly*, *Indian Antiquary*, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, JRASB, JBORS, JBRS, JUPHS, JAHS, J. Orissa Historical Research Society, JBBRAS, *Memoirs of*



the Archaeological Survey of India, Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Western Circle.

(v) *Coins.*

Altekar, A. S.—*The Relative Prices of Metals and Coins in Ancient India* (JNSI. Vol. II. 1940).

Chakraborty S. K.—*Currency Problems of Ancient India* (JDL, Vol. XXX, 1938) pp. 37-70.

Cunningham, A.—*Coins of Mediaeval India*, London 1894.

Mirashi, V. V.—*The Coins of the Kalachuris* (JNSI. Vol. III. Pt. I. 1941).

Reu, B. N.—*The Coins of Marwar*.

Singhal, C. R.—*Bibliography of Indian Coins*, Pt. I, Bombay, 1950.

Smith, V. A.—*Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXVII (1908) pp. 114-148.

Stein, M. A.—*Notes on the Monetary System in Ancient Kashmir* (Numismatic Chronicle, Vol. XIX. 1899).

The Term Dinnara and the Monetary System of Kashmir (Rājatarāṅgiṇī, Vol. II. Appendices Note H. pp. 308-328).

B. *Modern Works*

Altekar, A. S.—*History of Banaras*, 1937.

*State and Government in Ancient India*, Banaras, edition 1949.

*The Rashtrakūṭas and their Times*, Oriental Book Agency, Poona, 1934.

Arnold T. W.—*The Preaching of Islam*, London 1913.

Banerji, R. D.—*Bāṅglār Itihāsa* in Bengali, second edition.

*The Haihayas of Tripurī and their Monuments* (MASI. Vol. 23), Calcutta 1931.

Barua, B. M.—*Gayā and Bodh-Gayā*.

Beal, S.—*Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Translation from Chinese of Hiuen Tsang.

Bhandarkar, R. G.—*Complete Works of R. G. Bhandarkar*.

- Bhattacharyya, T. P.—*Vāstuvidyā*, Patna 1946.
- Bose, A. N.—*Social and Rural Economy of Northern India*.
- Brown, P.—*Indian Architecture* (Buddhist and Hindu).  
*Cambridge Mediaeval History*, Vol. I.
- Chakravarti, P. C.—*The Art of War in Ancient India*,  
 University of Dacca, 1941.
- Coomaraswamy, A. K.—*History of Indian and Indonesian  
 Art*, London 1927.
- Cunningham, A.—*Ancient Geography of India*, second  
 edition, Calcutta 1924.
- Dasgupta, S. N. and De, S. K.—*A History of Sanskrit Literature*, (Classical Period) Vol. I. Calcutta 1947.
- Davy and White—*Institutes of Timour*, Oxford, 1783.
- De, N. L.—*Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval  
 India*.
- Dikshitar, V. R. R.—*War in Ancient India* (second edition)  
 pub: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. 1948.
- Farquhar, J. N.—*An Outline of the Religious Literature of  
 India*, Oxford, 1920.
- Forbes, K.—*Rās Mālā*, edited by H. G. Rawlinson, 1924.
- Gangoly, O. C.—*The Art of the Chandelas* (Rupa & Co.)  
 Calcutta 1957.
- Ganguly, D. C.—*History of the Paramāra Dynasty*, Dacca  
 1933.
- Ghoshal, U. N.—*Contributions to the History of the Hindu  
 Revenue System*, Calcutta 1929.  
*The Agrarian System in Ancient India*.
- Ghurye, G. S.—*Caste and Class in India*, Pub: Philosophical  
 Library, New York, 1950.
- Gupte, B. A.—*Hindu Holidays and Ceremonials*, pub:  
 Thacker Spink & Co., Calcutta 1916.
- Habibullah, A. B. M.—*Foundation of the Muslim Rule in  
 India*.
- Haig, W.—*The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. III.
- Hallam—*View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*,  
 Vol. 1,

- Handiqui, K. K.—*Yāśastilaka and Indian Culture*, pub: Jivaraja Granthamālā Series No. 2, Sholapur 1949.
- Haskins—*The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*.
- Hazra, R. C.—*Studies in the Puranic Records of Hindu Rites and Customs*, pub: University of Dacca, 1940.
- Cherefeddin Ali—*History of Timur Bec*, Volume II, London. 1723.
- Hitti, P. K.—*History of the Arabs*.
- Hussain, Y.—*Mediaeval Indian Culture*.
- Indraji, Bhagabanlal—*Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I
- Jha, G. N.—*Comparative Notes on Manu* in three volumes pub: Cal. University, 1924-1929  
*Manu Smṛti* with text and translation of commentary of Medhātithi.
- Kane, P. V.—*History of Dharmaśāstra* in four volumes.
- Keith, A. B.—*History of Sanskrit Literature*.
- Keay, F. E.—*Ancient Indian Education*, Oxford Univ. Press 1918.
- Kramrisch, S.—*Pāla and Sena Sculptures*, Calcutta 1929.
- Krishnamachariar, M.—*History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*.
- Majumdar, A. K.—*The Chaulukyas of Gujarat*, (Bharatiya Vidya Series, IV).
- Majumdar, B. B. and Mitra, K. N.—*Vidyāpati* (in Bengali and Hindi) pub: Sarat Kumar Mitra, Calcutta.
- Majumdar, R. C.—*Corporate Life in Ancient India* (second edition) Calcutta 1922.  
 —*Edited History of Bengal*, Vol. I.
- Majumdar, R. C. and Altekar, A. S.—*The Vākāṭaka Gupta Age* (A New History of the Indian People, Vol. VI)
- Majumdar, R. C. and Madhavananda—*Great Women of India* pub: Rama Krishna Mission.
- Majumdar, R. C. and Pusalker—*The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan Series).  
*The Classical Age*, (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan Series).  
*The Struggle for Empire* (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan Series, Bombay, 1957).

- McCrindle—*Ancient India as described by Megasthenes.*
- Mitter, D. N.—*The Position of Women in Ancient India.*
- Mitra, R. C.—*The Decline of Buddhism in India*, Visva-bharati, 1954.
- Mookerji, R. K.—*Ancient Indian Education* (second edition) Macmillan & Co. London, 1951.
- Local Government in Ancient India.*
- Munshi, K. M.—*The Glory that was Gurjaradeśa*, Part III.
- Nainar, S. M. H.—*Arab Geographers' Knowledge of Southern India*, Madras, 1942.
- Ojha, G. H.—*History of Rajputana.*
- Pran Nath—*A Study in the Economic Condition of Ancient India*, London 1929.
- Prasad, I.—*History of Mediaeval India* (second edition).
- Ray, H. C.—*Dynastic History of Northern India* in two volumes.
- Ray, J. C.—*Ancient Indian life*, Calcutta, 1948.
- Ray, Niharranjan—*Bāṅgālir Itihāsa.*
- Ray, P. C.—*History of Hindu Chemistry from the earliest times to the middle of the 16th century A. D.*, Calcutta, 1905. This book includes extracts from the Sanskrit texts like *Rasaratnākara*, *Rasapṛakāśasudhākara*, *Rasaratnasamuchchaya*.
- Raychaudhuri, H. C.—*Political History of Ancient India* (6th edition).
- Renou, L.—*The Civilization of Ancient India*, translated from the French by P. Spratt. Pub: Susil Gupta, Calcutta 1954.
- Reu, B. N.—*Glories of Marwar and the Glorious Rathors*, Pub: Jodhpur Archaeological Department, 1943.
- Sankalia, H. D.—*Studies in the Historical and Cultural Geography and Ethnography of Gujrat*, Poona, 1949.
- The University of Nalanda.*
- Sankrityayana, Rahul—*Tibbat Me Bauddhadharma* (in Hindi, reprint from Hindusthani, pt. IV. No. 1, 1934).

- Sastri, Haraprasad—*Hājār Bachharer Purāṇa Bāṅglā Bhāṣāy Baudha Gāna O Dohā*, Pub: Bangiya Sahitya Parisat, Calcutta, B. S. 1323.
- Schoff, W. H.—*Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*.
- Sen, B. C.—*Some Historical Aspects of the inscriptions of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1942.
- Sen, Sukumar—*Charyāgīti-Padāvalī*, Pub: Burdwan Sahitya Sabha, Burdwan 1956.
- Prāchīn Bāṅglā O Bāṅgālī*, Visvavidya Samgraha Series of Visvabharati, No. 12.
- Sircar, D. C.—*The Śākta Pīṭhas* (published in JRASB, Letters, XIV. No. 1, 1948).
- Tacitus—*History*, Vol. II.
- Thompson and Johnson—*An Introduction to Mediaeval Europe*,
- Titus—*Indian Islam*.
- Tod, J.—*Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, edited by W. Crooke, Oxford 1920.
- Trevelyan, G. M.—*English Social History*, Pub: Longmans, Green & Co., May 1948.
- Trivedi, B. B.—*Chānd Baradāyī Aur Unkā Kāvya* (in Hindi).
- Vaidya, C. V.—*History of Mediaeval Hindu India*.
- Vidyabhusana, S. C.—*History of Indian Logic*,  
*History of Mediaeval School of Indian Logic*.
- Vogel, J. Ph.—*Antiquities of Chamba State*. Pt. I.
- Wilson—*An Essay on the Hindu History of Cashmir*.
- Wilson, I. H.—*Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms*, 1885
- Yule, Henry—*The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, revised by Henry Cordier, London 1920.

### C. Catalogue of Manuscripts.

*A Catalogue of Palm-leaf and Selected paper Manuscripts belonging to the Darbār Library, Nepal*, edited by H. P. Sastri, 1905.

*Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in Mithilā*, Vol. I. edited by K. P. Jayaswal and A. Banerji-Sastri.

*Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. in the Library of the India Office.*

*Journals and Periodicals*

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute; Asiatic Researches; *Bhāratīya Vidyā*; *Bhūratakaumudī*; Historical Miscellany, edited by Dr. K. K. Datta, Patna College Archaeological and Historical Society; Indian Culture; Indian Historical Quarterly; Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society; Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society; Journal of the Bihar Research Society; Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; Journal of the Gangānāth Jha Research Institute, Allahabad; Journal of the Orissa Historical Research Society; Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, (Letters); Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland; Journal of the University of Bombay; Journal of the U. P. Historical Society; Patna University Journal; Poona Orientalist; *Rūpam*; *Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā*; Our Heritage, Calcutta; Hindusthan Standard (Magazine Section), Calcutta Newspaper; Spark (weekly paper), Patna.



## INDEX

### A

Abduction and its results, 132  
 'Abdullā, 128  
 Abhayākaragupta, 155  
 Abhayatilaka Gani, 277, 296  
 Abhimanyu, 15  
 Aboriginal tribes, 113  
 Abu Zeid, 20, 208, 263, 371  
 Actors, 253  
     position, 78  
*Āḍhavāpas*, 176  
*Adhīśvara*, 23  
*Ādityadarśana*, 150  
 Adultery, 378  
*Agni Purāṇa*, 6, 15, 29, 43, 63,  
     112, 188, 199, 282, 380  
*Agrahāra*, 91, 156  
 Agrawala, V. S. 217  
 Agricultural labour, wages, 184  
*Agulmaka* army, 12  
 Āhavamalla, 16  
 Ahmad Niyāltigin, 215  
 Aiḍadeva, 27  
 Air force, 53  
 Aiyaka, 44  
*Akara-adhīśvara*, 24  
*Akṣaya-tritīyā*, 266  
 Alankāra, 159  
 Alberūni, 79, 107, 145, 150, 159,  
     163, 210, 225, 275, 276, 277,  
     279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284,  
     285, 286, 287, 290, 291, 293,  
     295, 296, 298, 300, 301, 305,  
     320, 362, 372.  
     on Brāhmana fanaticism, 128  
     on Brāhmana traders, 87  
     on castes, 79  
     on Indian ships, 54  
     on womens' right to pro-  
     perty, 136

Āhaṇadeva (Chāhamāna), 232,  
     284  
 Alliances of Hindus against  
     Turks, 69  
 Almshouses, 262-263  
 Altekar, A. S., 10, 25, 87, 139,  
     216, 217, 220  
 Alum, 202  
 Al-Idrisi, 369  
 Al-Mas'ūdī, 360  
 Amareśvara, 317, 319  
 Ambaśthas, 104  
 Amīr Khusrav, 131  
 Amusements, 256, 373-376,  
     of Kings, 356-357  
 Ānanda, 102  
 Ānandaśhaṭṭa, 108  
 Ānandapāla (Sāhiya), 69 and ele-  
     phants, 52  
 Ānandapura, 248  
 Anaṅgavajra, 377  
 Ananta (Lohara), 90, 137, 363  
 Anantavarman (Chodagaṅga), 2,  
     14  
 Anantavāsudeva, 93  
 Aṅga, 2, 3  
     chiefs, 19  
     swords, 58  
 Anhilwāra, 246  
 Aniruddha, 80  
*Antyajās*, 79, 107, 109, 110, 111,  
     112  
*Anu-sāmanta*, 23  
 Aparārka, 78, 145, 166, 179, 207,  
     210, 211, 235  
     on degrading professions, 78  
*Aparū-vidyā*, 145  
 Apprentices, 146, 186  
*Aprahata* land, 175  
 Arab horses, 50  
 Arab invaders, fear of, 82



*Aribala*, 46  
*Arisirñha* (poet), 236  
*Arjuna*, 4  
 Arms, 198  
     and *Brāhmaṇas*, 85  
 Army chiefs got villages, 43  
 Army of feudal lords, 12  
 Army, its strength, 55  
     according to *Śukra*, 56  
     types of, 12  
*Arnorāja* (*Cbāhamāna*), 127  
*Arthaśāstra*, 146, 151, 356.  
 Artificial forests, 183  
 Artists, their position, 146  
*Āryāsaptasatī*, 380  
*Āsamati*, 32  
*Asawal*, 246  
 Assessment of land revenue, 174.  
     175  
*Askari*, S. H., on *Sūfī* saints, 128  
     129  
 Astrologers, 61, 63, 266, 273  
     their position, 78  
 Astrology, 151  
     baneful influence, 266  
*Aṭavī-bala*, 46  
*Atiśa* *Dīpaṅkara*, 155, 161  
 Autumn, best time for expedition.  
     60  
*Avantivarman*, 31  
*Ayodhya*, 318  
*Āyurveda* as a *śilpa*, 146

## B

*Badarī*, 320  
*Badhatau*, 111, 112  
*Bakhtyār Khaljī*, 163  
*Bālāditya*, 164  
*Balipūjā*, 295  
*Banāras*, 3, 320  
     Swords, 58  
*Banerji*, R. D., 217  
 Bankers, 78

Banking, 220-226  
*Barbosa*, 197  
*Barhaspatya Arthaśāstra*, 316,  
     356  
*Barley*, 178, 258, 292  
 Battle array, 64  
 Swords of soldiers, 49  
*Bedias*, 113  
 Beef-eating, 130  
 Begging by pupils, 165  
*Betel*, chewing, 49  
     leaves, 180, 295  
*Bhāga*, 230  
*Bhagalpore*, 3  
*Bhandarkar*, D. R. 373  
*Bhaṭa*, 171  
*Bhatārka*, 9  
*Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva*, 80, 85, 89, 92,  
     173, 258, 261  
     his learning, 151  
*Bhaṭṭa Brāhmaṇas*( 94  
*Bhaṭṭa school*, 151  
*Bhattacharyya*, B., 377  
*Bhattacharyya*, Tarapada, 380,  
     382  
*Bhattacharyya*, U. N., 377  
*Bhaumakaras*, 10  
*Bhikṣūchāra*, 18, 33  
*Bhīma I* (*Chaulukya*), 5, 46  
*Bhīma II* (*Chaulukya*), 233  
*Bhīma Kaivarta*, 1, 45, 111  
*Bhīmasaṅkara*, 320  
*Bhinmal Brāhmaṇa*, 82  
*Bhoga*, 230  
*Bhoja* (*Paramāra*), 4, 36  
*Bhoja*, 292, 294, 296, 302, 304,  
     307, 371  
*Bhojadeva* on air force, 53  
*Bhojavarmān* (*Chandella*), 102  
*Bhratribhaṭṭa*, 83  
*Bhrātridivītiya* not observed in  
     U. P., 296.  
*Bhrūta* soldiers, 44  
*Bhuvanesvara*, 382, 383  
*Bilhaṇa*, 252, 360, 378  
*Billon coins*, 216

**Boats, 54**  
     classified, 250  
     making of, 204  
*Bodhisattvyūvadānakalpalatā*, 370  
*Bodikas*, 217  
 Bonus, 185  
 Books, 166  
 Boots, 204  
 Booty, 57  
 Brahmadeva, 262  
 Brahma-kṣatriya, 83  
 Brāhmaṇas, 79-94  
     as *Sāmanta*, 91  
     as soldiers, 43  
     instances of wickedness, 84  
     of regions held inferior, 93  
     their wealth, 92  
*Brahma Purāṇa*, 38, 374  
*Brihaddharma Purāṇa*, 108, 375  
 Brihaspati, 2  
*Brihat-saṁhitā*, 380  
 Bronze industry, 209  
 Budha Gupta, 8  
 Buddhaśrī, 154  
 Buddhaśrīmītra, 164  
 Bulls, in army, 50  
     Sacrificed, 260

### C

Capital punishment for Brāhmaṇas, 88  
 Car festival, in Purī, 303  
     of Durgā, 285, 290  
     of Durgā, Mahādeva and Sun, 303  
     of Jagannātha, 305  
     of Kṛṣṇa, 306  
 Caste system and soldiers, 49  
 Cause of the rise of feudalism, 5  
 Cavalry force, 31  
     its importance, 50  
*Chakradatta*, 147  
*Chakrapānidatta*, 192, 203, 368  
 Chakravarti, Chintaharan, 111  
 Chakravarti, S. N., 216, 217  
 Chamba, 4  
 Champāran, 245  
 Chaṇḍālā, 111  
 Chandellas, 1, 28  
 Chaṇḍeśvara, 16, 23, 26, 186, 263, 275, 276, 280, 281, 284, 285, 290, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 298, 299, 304, 359, 375, 376  
     on deposits, 223  
     on legal status of feudatories, 23  
 Chaṇḍidāsa, 151  
 Chandradeva, 3, 280, 318  
 Chandra Gupta II, 8  
 Chandra Kings, 18  
 Chandrarāja, 69  
 Chāndrāyana, 131  
*Charchari*, 255  
 Chariot, 53, 290, 292  
     making, 209  
 Chau Ju-Kua, 372  
 Chauladevī, 371  
*Cheurapañchūśikā*, 378  
 Chhaṭ, 307  
*Chāṭa*, 171  
 Chinese pilgrims to Gayā, 162  
 Chinese silk, 194  
 Chisti, 123  
 Chitābhūmi, 319  
 Chitor, 4  
 Chitrakuta, 320  
 Chowdhury, T. P., 177  
 Chuḍālā, 139  
 Cities, 246  
 City life, 249  
 Civil liberty, absence of, 34  
 Civil officers as feudatories, 10  
 Clocks and watches, 147  
 Cocoanuts, 258  
 Confederacy, 4  
     of Rājput princes, 69  
 Conscription, absence of, 44  
 Convict labour, 190  
 Copper industry, 201  
 Ceration and *Sāmantas*, 20  
 Cost of production, 230  
 Cotton, 179  
 Courses of study, 149

Courtezans, 373  
     corporation of, 371  
*Cowrie*, 219  
 Craftsmen, position of, 78, 146  
 Crops destroyed by army, 171  
 Crucibles, 198  
 Cultivators, 177  
 Cunningham, A., 216

## D

Dacoits in Vaṅga, 205  
 Dālhaṇa, 207  
 Dālā, 11  
 Dākinī, 319  
 Dāmaras, 30-32  
     and marriage, 18  
     their salary, 23  
*Dandupat*, 222  
 Dāmodaragupta, 161, 224  
*Dānasāgara*, 140  
 Dances, 297, 301  
 Dancing, 254, 285, 289, 290, 293,  
     371, 373  
     girls, 235, 358, 359, 373  
     of harlots, 298  
*Dakṣopanata*, 7  
 Dandīla, 370  
 Darbhapaṇi, 89  
*Darpadalana*, 163  
 Darukavana, 319  
 Dasapura feudal chiefs, 8  
 Daśaratha, 81  
 Datān, 129  
 Demand for labour, 184  
 Devadāsīs, 371-373, 383  
 Devakhaḍga, 10  
 Devala, 78  
     on agriculture, 86  
     on classes of Brāhmaṇas, 83  
     on profession of Vaiśyas, 96  
     on *Suddhi*, 131-133  
 Devala Brāhmaṇa, 77  
 Devanṇabhaṭṭa, 184  
 Devapāla, 89  
 Devarakṣita, 12, 13

Devavarman, 16  
 Devīkoṭa, 153  
 Deśopanata, 7  
 Destruction of crops by armies,  
     61  
 Dhaṅga, 100, 362, 363  
*Dhanurveda*, 146  
     its branches, 147  
 Dharasena, 9  
 Dharmapāla, 10  
 Dharmasvāmin, 154, 164  
 Dhenḍhanapāda, 264  
 Dhoyī, 140, 370, 380  
 Dhruva, 11  
 Dhyānabhaḍra, 165  
 Diddā, 15  
*Diliwals*, 216  
 Dinnāra, 218, 222  
 Dinner ceremony and feudalism,  
     20  
 Dīpankara Śrījñāna, 161, 162  
 Divākarachandra, 155  
 Divyoka, 111  
 Doab, 3  
 Domba, 111, 112  
 Dramas, 251, 277, 297  
 Dramatists, 252  
*Drammas*, 215, 216, 220, 224  
 Dreams, 62  
 Dress, 194-195  
 Drinks, 260  
*Droṇa* of land, 175  
 Dubkund, 4  
*Dukūla*, 193  
 Durgā, 228  
     temple, 380  
 Duties of slaves, 187  
*Dyūta-pratipada*, 295

## E

Education, criteria of, 163  
 Effects of Mahmūd's invasions, 125  
 Eighteen *vidyas*, 147  
*Ekādaśī*, 66  
 Ekāmra, 317, 318

Elephants, 51-52  
 Emergency taxation, 239  
 Empire of Karna, 5  
 Enamelling, 147  
 Escheat, 234  
 Evils of war, 68  
 Excise duty, 233  
 Excommunication, 211  
 Exemption from taxes, 87  
 Expedition, suitable time, 60  
 Export of leather, 204  
 Expulsion, 155

## F

Famine, 170  
     and taxation, 238  
 Fasting, 275, 280, 283, 287, 291,  
     298, 299, 300, 301, 304  
 Fatalism, 63, 265  
 Female slaves, 187  
 Festivals, 274-315  
     *Akṣayatriṭīya*, 280  
     and harvesting, 302-303, and  
     illumination, 294, 297, 303  
     *Anodanasaptamī*, 275  
     *Aśoka*, 290  
     *Aśokāṣṭamī*, 275  
     *Bahand*, 276, 277  
     *Bhāuam*, 283, 305  
     *Bhūtridvīṭīyā*, 296, 304  
     car of Durgā 285-286, 290  
     *chorali*, 304  
     commemoration of victory  
     of Muttai, 279  
     comparison between medi-  
     aeval and modern, 305-307  
     *Dakṣiṇīyaṇa*, 283  
     *Damanaka chaturdaśī*, 278  
     *Daśaharā*, 281-282, 304  
     *Dīpotsava* or *Dipālikā*, 294-  
     295  
     *Divālī*, 294-296  
     *Dola*, 276, 305  
     *Durvāṣṭamī*, 287  
     *Gaihaṭ*, 290  
     *Gaurivratā*, 280  
     *Govinda-dvādaśī*, 302

*Guṇalahid* (?), 285  
*Haritalikā*, 286  
 held only in Gujarat-Maha-  
     rastra, 304  
*Hindoli-chaitra*, 275  
*Holi*, 276-277  
*Indradhvajochchhrāya* or  
*Indrotthāpana*, 287-289, 305  
*Jagaddhātripūjā*, 296  
*Kāmamahotsava*, 276  
*Kuntāradīpadāna*, 292, 307  
*Karūra* (?), 284  
*Kaumudimahotsava*, 297, 304  
     375, 376  
*Kojāgarapūrṇimā*, 292  
*Kūrmadvādaśī*, 299  
 lack of uniformity in obser-  
     vance, 304-305  
*Layam*, 305  
*Madanadvādaśī*, 275-276  
*Mahājyaiṣṭhī*, 282  
*Mahīmāna*, 302  
*Mansartaku*, 301  
*Matsyadvādaśī*, 282  
*Navālaya*, 304  
*Neṇḍariā*, 290  
*Nirājana*, 293  
 Non-existence in 12th Cen-  
     tury, 306-307  
*Nrisiṅghadvādaśī*, 302  
 of Jhailamallas, 278  
 on commencement of New  
     Year, 274  
*Padmanābhadvādaśī*, 291  
*Pāśanachaturdaśī*, 298  
*Poulao*, 294, 305  
*Rasakalyāṇivratā*, 300  
*Raṭanīchaturdaśī*, 299  
*Rathasaptamī*, 300  
*Rṣipāñchamī*, 286  
 Sacred to Bhadrakālī, 291  
     *Gaurī*, 298, 300  
     *Hari*, 276  
     *Kṛṣṇa*, 286  
     *Mahādeva*, 299  
     *Rukmiṇī*, 275  
     *Somanātha*, 284

- Vāsudeva, 279, 283  
     294, 298  
 Viṣṇu, 291  
*Sākārtam*, 299  
*Sarkarāsaptamī*, 280  
*Sāvarotsava*, 291, 307  
*Sīvarūri*, 301  
*Śrīpañchamī*, 300, 304  
*Sukhasuptikā* or  
*Sukharātri*, 294  
*Ubhayanavamī*, 283  
*Udakasevāmahotsava*, 293,  
     307  
*Varachaturthī*, 300, 304  
*Vasantotsava*, 277  
*Vijayadvīdaśī*, 290  
*Vorallī*, 284  
 waking up of Vāsudeva, 296  
 worship of the Buddha, 281,  
     284  
     Durgā, 283  
     Earth, 278-279  
     Ekānāṅgā, 297  
     Ganges, 280  
     Irā, 279  
     Kāma, 275  
     Satī, 291  
     Skanda, 274  
     Sthānanāga, 298  
     Sun, 275, 283, 299, 307  
     Varuṇa and  
     Vasudhā, 290
- Feudal anarchy**, 33  
**Feudal disintegration**, 1  
**Feudalism**, 1-41  
     and hereditary army, 42  
     European and Indian, 33-34  
     in Assam, 9  
     its disservices, 28-29  
     Origin, 5  
**Feudatories**  
     and foreign relations 13  
     causes of increase in num-  
     ber, 13  
     Causes of increase in power  
     18  
     of Gurjara-Pratīhāras, 10  
     Fire-arms, 59-60  
     Fish, 258-259  
     Food, of soldiers, 68  
         for poor people, 261-262  
         forbidden vegetarian, 258  
     Forced labour, 188, 189  
     Foreign relations of feudatories,  
         13  
     Forest army, 46  
     Fruits, 178
- C**
- Gadhāya* coin, 218  
*Gadyāna* coin, 232  
*Gūhaḍavālas*, 2, 28  
 Gambling, 295  
 Games, 254  
*Gāmus* of Brāhmaṇas, 80  
*Gāndharva-veda*, 146  
*Gaṇeśa*, 282  
*Gaṇeśa-chaturthī*, 307  
*Gaṇgādhara*, 81, 173, 262  
*Gaṇgāsāgara-saṅgama*, 320  
*Gāṇgeyadeva*, 3, 215, 362, 363  
*Ganguly*, O. C., 208, 380  
     381, 382  
*Ganguly*, D. C., 126  
*Ganjshakar*, 129  
*Gardizi*, 275, 279, 280, 281, 282,  
     284, 286, 287, 290, 295, 298,  
     300, 301, 302, 305  
     on suicide, 364-366  
*Gargachandra*, 18, 29, 33  
*Gauḍa*, army, 55  
     Kāyastha, 100, 104, 105,  
         soldiers, 48-49  
         students, 165  
*Gautamītaṭa*, 319  
*Gayā*, 3, 318, 319  
     Vihāra, 153  
*Gayawals*, 81  
*Ghoshal*, U. N., 87, 96, 136, 140,  
     152, 230, 255, 372  
     on exemption from taxes, 87  
     on improvement of position  
         of women, 136  
     on Rājputs, 96

Ghrīṣṇeśa, 319  
 Ghūrī, 67  
 Ghurye, G. S., 94  
*Gītāgovinda*, 379  
 Glass industry, 203  
 Gode, P. K., 195, 370  
     on soap-making, 207  
*Gokara*, 237  
 Gokarṇa, 319  
 Golakimaṭha, 158  
 Gold, 202  
     Currency, 215  
 Goldsmith, position of, 78  
 Gopal, M. H., 230  
 Gopal III, 27  
 Gopālabhāṣṭa, 277  
*Gopas*, 8  
*Govardhana*, 85  
 Govardhanāchārya, 379  
 Govinda III, 2  
 Govindachandra, 2, 4, 17, 266.  
     280, 288  
 Govindapāla, 3  
 Govindarāja of Saurāstra, 262  
 Grains, 178  
 Grammar, 151  
 Grant of land with right to levy  
     taxes, 19  
 Grazing ground, 180  
 Great kings of the period, 4  
 Guhilas, 1  
 Guild levies, 45  
 Guilds, 183  
     Organisation of, 209  
 Gujrati soldiers' dress, 49  
*Gulmībhūta* army, 12  
 Guravamiśra, 44  
 Gurjara-Partihāra empire, 1

## H

Habib, M. Prof. 43, 115  
*Hāḍi*, 111, 112  
 Halāyudha, 80, 150  
*Hammīramahākāvya*, 359  
 Hammīravarman, 131  
*Haribhaktivilāsa*, 305

Harirāja, 359  
 Harischandra, 286, 287  
 Harisimhaḍeva, 23  
 Harivarman, 81, 173  
 Harṣa (Lohara), 28, 31, 32, 47,  
     52, 89, 90, 173, 359  
 Harṣavardhana, 10  
 Harvests and expeditions, 61  
 Harvesting time, 171  
 Hemachandra, 130, 152, 253, 257,  
     258, 260, 276, 280, 283, 284,  
     286, 291, 294, 296, 302, 304,  
     305, 359, 368  
     on deceitful merchants, 369  
     on Indrapūjā, 289  
 Hemādri, 275, 278, 280, 295, 298  
 Hemp cloth, 194  
 Hereditary ministers, 17  
 Hereditary nature of military  
     office, 9  
 Hereditary offices, 16  
     profession, 184  
*Hina-sāmama*, 23  
 Hindu confederacy, 66  
 Hindu women captured by Turks,  
     132  
 Hired soldiers, 47  
 Holidays for labourers, 185  
 Horses, their paucity, 51  
     their quality, 50-51  
*Hridayaśiva*, 157  
*Hudūd-ai-alam*, 372  
 Hūṇas, 114  
     their invasion, 8  
*Hundies*, 223  
 Hunger-strike, 90  
 Hussain, Y., on Hindu influence  
     on *Tazīyās*, 131

## I

Ibn Asir, 125  
 Ideal Brāhmaṇas, 79  
 Illumination of streets and  
     houses, 375  
 Immoral life of kings, 357  
 Inauspicious signs, 62

Increase in demand for labour, 184  
 Indian swords, 198  
 Indra III, 2  
 Inns, 263-264  
 Insurance of workmen, 185  
 Interest, 222  
 Inter-marriage amongst feudatories, 18  
 Invasions of Turks, 127  
 Iron beams, 197  
 Irrigation, 172  
 Īśānaśiva, 372  
 Īśānavarman, 8  
 Ismā'ili sect, 130

## J

Jagaddala, 153  
 Jagaddhara, 17  
 Jagamalla, 277  
 Janārdana Gauḍa, 160  
*Janmāṣṭamī*, 257  
 Jātavarman, 18  
 Jayachandra (Gāhaḍavāla), 17, 94, 358  
 Jayadeva, 379  
 Jayanāga, 10  
 Jayānaka, 130  
 Jayapāla, (Sāhiya) 69, 362  
 Jayapāladeva (Kamrup), 161  
 Jayasinha (Chaulukya), 14, 262  
 Jāyaka, 31  
 Jetavana convent, 154  
 Jewellers, 209  
 Jimūtavāhana, 136, 259, 275, 276, 278, 280, 281, 285, 287, 288, 292, 294, 295, 296, 300, 304, 307, 319, 374, 376  
 Jinavallabha, 161  
 Jojalladeva, 372  
 Jyotirīśvara, 193  
*Jyotirīṅgas*, 319-320

## K

*Kāhana*, 217  
 Kaimvāsa, 67

Kaivartas, 111  
 Kalachuri (s), 1  
*Kalā* (s), 147  
 Kalaśa (Lohara), 84, 90  
*Kalāvīlāsa*, 109  
 Kalhaṇa, 31, 130, 289, 299, 358, 359, 360, 366  
     admitting fate, 265  
     on *devadāsīs*, 372  
     on dishonest merchants, 369  
     on Kāyasthas, 367  
*Kāmasūtra*, 381  
 Kanaka, 262  
 Kanakaśīlī, 154  
 Kanaui, 215, 245  
 Kandarpa, 156  
 Kane, P. V., 42, 86, 110, 221, 228, 317, 320  
     on segregation of unclean Brāhmaṇas, 78  
     on untouchables, 110  
*Kāntāra-dīpadāna*, 303  
 Kāntipur, 320  
*Kapardaka*, 217  
*Kapardaka-Purāṇa*, 219  
 Karapas, 103  
 Kaṣmakūras, 186  
 Karṇa (Kalachuri), 2, 4, 5, 14, 34, 215, 318  
     and subordinate kings, 20  
 Karṇasāgara, 173  
*Karoṭī*, 257  
*Kāśāpaṇa*, 217  
*Kāhāsariśāgara*, 220, 359, 360, 369  
*Kaumudī-mahotsava*, 303, 375-376  
 Kauṭīlya, 6, 69, 293, 373  
 Kāyasthas, 97-105  
     as soldiers, 44  
     their learning 100, 102, 104  
 Kedāra, 319, 320  
 Khajuraho, 140, 381, 382  
     sculptures, 209  
*Khariboli*, 129  
*Khila* land, 175  
 Khusrav Malik, 127

King, 228  
 and common folk, 34  
*Kirikaumudī*, 318  
*Koṭṭāgarā-pūrṇimā*, 304  
 Kolāvati queen, 372  
 Konārak, 381, 383  
 Kormādevī, 139  
*Kosopanata*, 7  
 Koṭṭālipāṭṭā, 81  
 Koṭṭitūtha, 317  
 Kṛṣṇa III, 2  
 Kṛṣṇamiśra, 252  
 Kṣātra Brāhmaṇas, 77  
 Kṣatriyas, 95-96  
 Kṣema, 137  
 Kṣemendra, 152, 266, 360, 361, 366  
   on Kāyasthas, 367  
   on merchants, 369  
   on prostitutes, 370  
   on quacks, 368  
 Kukkuṭasiddhi, 164  
*Kulajis*, 80  
 Kumāradevī, 154  
 Kumārapāla (Chaulukya), 14, 29,  
   277, 360, 371  
 Kurukṣetra, 318  
*Kusīda*, 225-226  
*Kuṭṭayuddha*, 65  
*Kuṭṭanīmata*, 370, 376  
 Kuvara-vihāra, 156

## L

Labour, 183  
 Labour-tax, 188-189  
 Lāhinī, 173  
 Lahore, 66  
 Lakṣmaṇasena, 379  
 Lakṣmaṇasvāmin, 373  
 Lakṣmīdhara, 61, 66, 84, 95, 135,  
   145, 149, 150, 170, 176, 178,  
   188, 204, 210, 224, 226, 228,  
   236, 249, 253, 257, 258, 259, 260  
   263, 264, 265, 274, 277, 278,  
   284, 285, 288, 290, 291, 292,  
   294, 297, 298, 299, 304, 317,  
   320, 360, 361, 366, 367, 374,  
   375, 376

Lakṣmīhikara, 161  
 Lalitāditya, 25, 30  
 Land and social status, 42  
 Land revenue, 174, 175, 228-230  
*Laṭṭakamelaka*, 259, 368  
 Lavaṇaprasāda, 13, 22, 358  
 Lavasena, 126  
*Lekhūpaddhati*, 187  
 Lending of goods on interest, 225  
 Liquor, 221  
 Loan transactions, 224  
 Loanable funds, 221, 222  
*Lohapaddhati*, 147  
 Lūṇapāsaka, 262, 280

## M

Madanapāla (Pāla), 3  
 Madanapāla (Gāhaḍavāla), 17,  
   318  
 Madanapālaśarmaṇ, 17  
*Madanotsava*, 376  
 Maṅga Brāhmaṇas, 81  
 Magadha rice, 179  
   swords, 59  
*Mahādvādaśī*, 289  
 Mahākāla, 320  
 Mahākumāras, 25  
 Mahallaka, 81  
*Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara*, 21, 22  
*Mahāmāṇḍalika*, 17  
*Mahaṇa*, 2, 13, 19  
*Mahārājū*, 22  
 Mahāsāmanta, 21, 22  
*Mahāsāmantaḍhipati*, 21  
*Mahāśīvagupta*, 80  
 Mahīpāla I (Pāla) 69, 89  
 Mahmūd's (Sultān) invasion,  
   effects, 125  
 Majumdar, A. K., 127, 128, 188,  
   268, 284  
 Majumdar, R. C., 107, 111, 136,  
   374  
   on improved position of  
     women, 136  
   on kaivartas, 111  
*Mālatīmādhava*, 376



- Malayasirihha, 28, 29, 174  
 Malladatta, 11  
 Malladeva, 151  
*Māṇa* measure, 264  
*Mūnasollūsa*, 1, 12, 259, 260, 356, 360, 367, 371  
*Maṇḍala* system, 69  
*Maṇḍala* theory, 45  
*Maṇḍalāhīṣa*, 22  
*Maṇḍalapati*, 10  
 Mandu, 245  
*Manoramā*, 379  
 Manoratha, 81  
 Manu, 6, 265, 367  
     on adultery, 378  
     on Brāhmaṇas taking fish, 259  
 Marco Polo, 193, 383,  
     on omens, 272-273  
 Mathana, 362  
*Maṭhas*, 156  
 Māthur Kāyasthas, 102-103  
 Mathurā, 215, 245, 320  
     iron industry, 197  
 Mattamayūra clan, 157  
 Maukharis, 8  
*Maula* army, 42  
 Maurya administration, 8  
 Mayaṇalladevi, 138  
 Meat, 259-260  
     offered to Manes, 299  
     taken by Brāhmaṇas, 291  
 Medhātithi, 6, 7, 12, 57, 149, 171, 185, 231, 265, 358  
     on booty, 57  
     on circle, 12  
     on conquest, 6  
     on expedition, 60  
     on firearms, 59  
 Medical leave, 185  
 Merchants, 369  
 Mercury, 203, 204  
 Merutunga, 155, 173, 238, 358, 362, 364, 367, 368, 371  
     on *devadūṣis*, 372  
     on position of queens, 138  
 Metallic industries, 192  
 Metallurgy, 147  
 Military service, 27  
 Milk preparations, 258  
 Ministers as feudatories, 17  
 Mirashi, V. V., 215  
 Mirrors, 203  
 Mithilā, 2, 159  
*Mithuna*, depiction of, 380 383  
*Mitra*, 7  
     troops, 45  
 Mitrayogi, 162  
 Mixed castes, 79  
 Monasteries, 153, 154  
 Monghyr, 3  
 Mookerji, Radhakumud, 207  
 Mortgage, 221  
 Mother, 135  
 Mt. Abu, 159  
 Muditaḥhadra, 164  
 Muhammad Ali, 126  
 Multan, 320  
*Muni*, 85  
 Muñja, 4, 83  
*Murqaba*, 129  
 Musical instruments, 254, 370, 373  
 Mutual jealousy, 69

## N

- Nāḍol, 4  
 Nāgara-Brāhmaṇa, 83, 86, 114  
*Nāgara-sarvasva*, 379  
 Nāgeśa, 319  
 Naigama Kāyastha, 103  
 Nāṅkidevi, 138  
 Nālandā, 147, 153  
     rebuilding of, 164-165  
*Nālika(s)*, 59, 60  
 Nāna, 102  
 Nānyadeva, 2, 29  
 Naraina, 68  
*Narapatiljayacharyā*  
     *Svarodaya*, 266  
*Nāṭyaśāstra*, 370  
*Nauvimāna*, 207  
*Navāha*, 291  
*Navānna* festival, 170

Navy, 53  
*Nīlamata Purāṇa*, 360  
*Nirājana* ceremony, 63  
 Niśchalakara, 368  
*Niṣka*, 220  
*Nāruddin*, 128  
*Nyāya*, 151  
*Nyāyakandalī*, 100, 151

## O

Octroi, 233  
 Odantapuri, 153  
 Offensive weapons, 58  
 Officers endowed with land, 7  
 Omission of names of overlords, 9  
 Onions, 258  
 Origin of feudalism, 5-9  
 Ornaments, 208-209  
 Overlords' name not mentioned, 26

## P

Paddy, 179  
*Pag-Sam-Jon-Zang*, 164  
*Pālas*, 3  
*Palapāla*, 3  
*Pamba sar*, 173  
*Paṇa*, 220  
*Pañchadaśī*, 132  
*Pañchamahāśabda*, 22, 24, 25  
*Paṇḍitavihāra*, 153  
*Paramāras*, 28  
*Paramardī*, 17  
*Paramardideva*, 153  
*Parā Vidyā*, 145  
*Parivrājaka Mahārājas*, 9  
*Pāṭaka* of land, 176  
*Pāṭaliputra* as a centre of learning, 159  
*Patna*, 3  
*Pattī*, 50, 55  
 Paucity of good horses, 51  
*Periplus*, 193  
*Phullahari monastery*, 153

Physicians, 78, 368  
 Pilgrimage of slave girls, 187  
 Pilgrimage-tax, 236  
*Pīṭhī*, 27  
*Putripakṣa*, 286  
*Poulao*, 294  
 Poets and moral standard, 378-380  
 Police functions, 239  
 Polo, 256  
 Poverty of the people, 264-265  
*Prabhākara school*, 151  
*Prabhāsa*, 319  
*Prahāsa*, 161  
*Prākṛita-pāṇigala*, 257  
*Prayāga*, 318, 319  
 Priests' position, 76  
 Primary education, 149  
*Prithvīdeva I*, 26  
*Prithvīdeva II*, 17  
*Prithvirāja I*, 262  
*Prithvirāja III*, 4, 69  
     a victim to stratagem, 65  
     causes of defeat, 66-67  
     cavalry force, 55  
 Private warfare by feudal lords, 34  
 Proportion of infantry to cavalry, 50  
 Prostitutes, 370-371  
     as nuns, 156  
     participation in festivals, 288  
 Provisions for invading army, 170  
 Pulses, 177, 258  
 Punishment to slaves, 188  
*Purāṇa coin*, 175, 217  
*Purandara*, 157  
*Purdah*, 141-142  
*Purī*, 319, 381, 382, 383  
*Purohitas*, 84, 85  
*Pūrṇapāla*, 173  
*Puraṇottama*, 318  
*Puṣkara*, 320

## Q

Queens, 137

## R

- Raḍḍādevī, 138  
 Rahamānas, 130  
 Rahul Sankrityayana, 161  
 Rājā, 23  
*Rājadharmā-kāṇḍa*, 371, 376  
*Rājamārtāṇḍa*, 282, 286, 288, 293, 376  
*Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, 289, 302  
 Rajputs and Kṣatriyas, 96f.  
 Rajendra Chola, 2  
 Rājyapāla, 4, 27  
 Rāka, 44  
 Rāmachandra of Devagiri, 371  
*Rāmācharita*, 257  
*Rāmanavamī*, 306  
 Rāmānuja, 383  
 Rāmapāla, 1, 19, 53, 362  
 Rāmāvatī, 370  
 Rāmdeo, 130  
 Rāmeśvara, 319, 320  
 Ramiyān, 372  
*Rāṇuka*, 11, 21, 22, 28, 211, 235  
 Rank, in court, 16  
     in royal court, 21  
     of feudatories, 21  
*Rasādhyāya*, 368  
*Rasūṇava*, 147, 192, 368  
 Rāṣṭrakūṭa feudatories, 10  
 Rate of interest, 224, 225  
 Rats as eatables, 220  
 Ratnakīrti, 154  
 Ratnarakṣita, 164  
*Rāuta*, 17, 21, 28  
 Ray, H. C., 234  
 Ray, Jogesh Chandra, 276  
 Ray, Niharranjan, 104, 380  
 Recruitment of hired soldiers, 47  
 Relatives as feudatories, 15  
 Repair of roads, 190  
 Rice, 177, 257, 290, 292, 298, 302, 383  
     preparations of, 258  
 Risky trades, 225  
 Road cess, 234

- Roads, condition of, 231  
 Rṣi, 83  
 Rudramāna, 173  
 Rudrapāla, 137  
 Rudraśiva, 172  
*Rūpaka*, 220, 232  
*Rūpa-pañch* (?), 282

## S

- Sabaras, 113  
 Sabarīpāda, 195  
*Saduktikarṇāmṛita*, 361, 379, 380  
 Śāhī, 131  
 Sajjana, 14  
 Śākadvipī Brāhmaṇas, 81-82  
*Sakara-rājās*, 24  
 Saksenā Kāyasthas, 103  
 Śākyāśrī, 162  
 Salakhanavarman, 28  
 Sales tax, 234  
 Salhaṇa, 18, 32  
 Sālina Brāhmaṇas, 80  
 Sallakṣanavarman, 28  
 Salt, 197  
 Samāchāradeva, 10  
 Samādhi, 129  
 Sāmālavarman, 81  
*Sāmantas*, as enemies, 15  
     their functions, 70  
 Sāmantasena, 83  
*Samarūṅgaṇasūtradhāra*, 381, 382  
 Saṁgrāmarāja, 32  
 Saṁgrāmapāla, 32  
*Samrāt*, 23-24  
 Samudra Gupta, 8  
*Samudratilaka*, 266  
 Sandhyākaranandī, 1, 130, 370  
 Sankuka, 130  
 Śāntipāda, 195  
*Śāntiparva*, 6  
 Śaraṇa, 251, 379  
 Sarayūpārī Brāhmaṇas, 81  
 Sarkar, J. N., 67  
*Sūrṅgadhara-paddhati*, 361  
 Sarvānanda, 80, 259

- Sarvāṅgasundarī*, 379  
*Śaśāṅka*, 9  
*Sataghnas*, 59  
*Śātātapa*, 263  
*Satī* 363  
*Sāvarotsava*, 374-375  
 Sen, B. C., 236  
 Sculpture, 380-383  
     Mithuna in Bihar, 382  
*Shubeborāt*, 131  
 Sharing of crops, 184  
 Shihāb-ud-dīn Muhammad, 67, 68  
 Siddhala village, 80  
 Siddharāja, 128, 216, 360, 367  
 Śikhara, 176  
 Śilāhāras, 10  
 Śillī, 139  
 Silver, 202  
 Singer, position of, 78  
 Sinha, B. P., 52  
 Sircar, D. C., 3, 105, 139, 175, 266, 374, 375  
     on Kāyasthas, 99  
     on Vaidyas, 105  
     on women as fighters, 139  
 Sītā, poetess, 140  
 Śiva, 374  
 Śivālaya, 319  
 Skanda, 66  
 Slavery, 186, 187, 188  
*Smaradīpikā*, 379  
 Soap-making, 207  
 Soil, its defects, 148  
 Soldiers, and tax-free land, 42  
     of Bengal, 48-49  
     their caste, 43  
     their dress, 48  
 Somadeva Sūri, 239, 295, 358  
 Somanātha, 161, 215, 236, 245  
 Somapura, 153  
 Someśvara I, 4, 362  
 Someśvara III, 2  
 Someśvara Chālukya, 1  
 Spears, 198  
 Spoils of war and soldiers, 57  
*Śreṇī*, 183, 210  
     army, 45  
 Śrībhadrā, 162  
 Śrīdhara, 151  
 Śrīdharadāsa, 264  
 Śrīharsa, 282, 361  
 Śrīmāla Brāhmaṇas, 82  
 Śrīnāthāchārya, 292  
 Śrīparvata, 319, 320  
 Śrīvāstava Kāyasthas, 100  
 Standing army small, 46  
*Śthānikas*, 8  
 Stratagem, 64  
*Struggle for Empire*, 273  
 Study of the Vedas, 149  
 Sub-infeudation, 9, 28  
 Sub-mortgage, 221  
 Subsidiary alliance, 7  
 Succession to throne, 138  
*Suddhi*, 131-133  
 Śūdras, 106-108  
 Śūdra-Brāhmaṇa 77  
 Sūfī saints, 128  
 Sugar, 196, 197  
 Sugarcane, 179, 258  
 Sūhava, 358, 362  
 Suicide, 361-366  
*Sukhasuptikā*, 361  
*Śukranītisāra*, 1, 356, 360, 368  
     on conquered kingdoms, 6-7  
     on fate, 265  
     on ministers, 366-367  
*Sūktimuktāvalī*, 361  
 Sulaiman, 257, 261, 359, 378  
 Śulapāṇi, 211  
*Sulka*, 230-231  
 Sulphate, 201  
 Sulphide, 201  
 Sulphur, 202  
 Surāstra, horses, 51  
     swords, 58  
 Sureśvara, 147, 366  
 Surgeons' position, 78  
 Sūryamatī, 137  
 Sūryayaśas, 162  
 Sussala (Lohara), 18, 29  
 Suvarṇavaṇīkas, 97, 108

*Svapōkas*, 112  
*Svapnachiniūmaṇi*, 266  
*Svarāṭṭ* king, 22  
 Swords, 58, 198

## T

Tacitus, 20  
*Talgra*, 248  
*Takṣaka-yātrā*, 360  
 Tanks, 173  
 Tanning industry, 204  
 Tantric Buddhism, 154  
 Tantricism, and sensual rites,  
     377  
     influence on sculpture, 383.  
 Tarain, battle of, 68, 69  
 Tāranātha, 164  
*Tarapati*, 205  
*Tarika*, 205  
 Tax on profits, 231  
 Teachers, economic position,  
     160-161  
     relation to pupils, 152  
 Technical education 145-146  
 Term of studentship, 149  
 Textile industry, 193, 194  
*Thakkura* 21, 28, 91, 101  
*Thakkura* Vasiṣṭha, 172  
 Thanesvar, 320  
 Theft detected by Brāhmaṇas, 91  
*Tila*, 179  
 Tilotha inscription, 187  
 Tiṅgyadeva, 14  
 Tin, 202  
 Tirhut regiment, 48  
*Tirthas* fallen into oblivion, 318  
*Tirthas*, for recital of the Vedas,  
     150  
 Tolls, 234  
 Trade tax, 234  
 Trailokyavarmān, 102  
 Train, 66  
 Transfer of regions, 3  
 Transference of allegiance of  
     feudatories, 29

Treachery as the cause of loss  
     of India's independence, 67  
 Trilochanapāla, 69, 196  
 Tripurāntaka, 319  
 Tryambaka, 320  
 Turks, their invasions, 127  
 Turkoman horses, 51  
 Turko-Afghan destruction of mon-  
     asteries, 163  
 Turuṣka troops in Kashmir  
     army, 47  
*Turuskadaṇḍa*, 126, 127, 237  
 Types of feudatories, 22

## U

Uchchala, 15, 29, 52, 89,  
     223  
*Udakasevāmahotsava*, 373  
 Udayāditya, 5, 174, 215, 278  
 Uddvotakesari, 15, 372  
 Udichyas, 82  
 Ujjain, 245, 319, 320  
 Umāpatidhara, 104, 358, 379  
 Umbrellas, 195, 290  
 Universities, 153-155  
 Utkarṣa, 15, 363

## V

Vāgbhaṭa, 368  
 Vaidika Brāhmaṇas, 81  
 Vaidyas, 105-106  
 Vaidyadeva, 14, 44  
 Vaidyanātha, 156, 319, 320  
 Vaidyanāth, King, 372  
 Vaijalladeva, 262, 296, 297  
*Vaijayantī*, 257  
 Vainyagupta, 9  
 Vairochana, 154  
 Vaiśyas, 96  
     as traders, 97  
     Brāhmaṇas, 77  
 Valabhī University, 155  
*Valādi*, 235  
 Vallabhadeva, 262

Vallālasena, 3, 80, 81, 95, 140,  
319, 320, 363  
Vallāla of Malwa, 29  
Vāmana, 66  
Vanapati, 44  
Vāra, 264  
Varāhamihira, 288  
Varanasi, 318, 320  
Varmans, 18  
*Varṇaratnōkara*, 193  
Varuṇasena, 9  
Vassals, grades, 21.  
obligations, 25  
Vastupāla, 252  
*Vāstuvīdyā*, 148  
Vātsyāyana, 276, 295, 370, 376  
Vegetables, 178  
Vidyādharma, 4, 17, 27  
Vidyāpati of Gauḍa, 160  
Vidyūraṇya, 132  
Vigrahapāla, 5  
Vigraharāja, 127  
Vijayapura, 370  
Vijayachandra, 17, 127  
Vijayasena, 372  
Vijayasimha and his ministers,  
17  
Vijñāneśvara, 77, 78, 88, 136,  
145, 146, 183, 194, 210, 221,  
225, 231, 378  
Vikramāditya VI, 2, 30  
Vikramasīla monastery, 153  
Vilāsadevī, 142  
Village life, 250  
Vimalaśiva, 157, 139  
*Vimānas*, 53  
Vinayabhadra, 165  
Vindhyāchala, 320  
Vipulaśrīmitra, 153  
Vīradhavalā, 358, 364  
Vīraśrī, 18  
Vīśaladeva, 252  
*Viṣṭi*, 189  
Viśvakhila, 370

Viśveśvara, 319, 320  
*Vodri*, 217  
*Vorallī*, 284  
*Vṛhi*, 177

## W

Wages of agricultural labour,  
184  
War as a passion, 68  
Wars of succession, 2, 4  
Washermen, 109, 110  
Watch-making, 209  
Weapons, offensive, 58, 59  
Weavers, 111  
Welfare functions, 239  
Wheat, 177, 257, 289, 290  
Widows' right to property, 235  
Wine, 260-261  
as a drink, 291, 298, 359-  
361, 373  
by women, 361  
Women, education, 139, 140  
position of, 135-144  
right to succession, 136  
salvation, 160  
Wooden furniture, 207  
Workmen's Insurance, 185  
Wrestling, 255

## Y

Yājñavalkya, 263, 378  
Yakṣapāla, 262  
*Yantras*, 58  
Yaśaḥ Karmā, 2, 172  
Yaśahpāla, 252  
*Yaśastilakachampū*, 262, 376  
Yaśodharman, 8  
*Yātrā*, 63  
*Yogīs*, 203  
*Yuktikalpataru*, 63, 204, 205, 206,  
207, 293, 294

# Errata

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
37	fn. no. 97	1295 A D.	1205 A.D.
39	fn. no. 150	DHNI III	DHNI II
48	8 from below	Nāgamati	Bāgamatī
55	13 „ above	Khurdāooah	Khurdādbah
56	2 „ below	atste	state
65	15 „ above	Paithvirāja	Prithvirāja
72	fn. no. 81	C H	CII
76	„ „ 165	HIND	HIED
86	4 from above	Viruddhavi- dhamsa	Viruddhavidhi- vidhvamsa
91	2 „ below	Dādśarman	Dādeśarman
92	fn.	Udamna	Udamāna
100	last line	1219-29	1219-20
111	14 from above	Vacendrī	Varendrī
117	fn. no. 86	XVII. B	XLII. B
122	fn. no. 230	p. 356	p. 256
122	fn. no. 232	16 f.	61 f.
132	10 from below	must be	must not be
133	fn. no. 4	XXII	XXVII
133	fn. no. 6	346	446
157	23 from above	Pulandara	Purandara
173	12 „ „	Maharāja	Moharāja
181	fn. no. 18	Rea	Reu.
191	fn. no. 25	1384	138.
199	13 from below	thirteenth	fourteenth
232	10 „ below	māraka	mānaka.
233	6 „ „	path	part
235	6 „ „	Bhamana	Bhanana
247	2 „ above	Prahādanapura	Pralhādanapura
251	4 „ „	liberties	libertines.
270	fn. no. 270	verse II	verse 11.
273	fn. no. 184	156	166
274	5 from above	feeling	feeding
275	19 „ „	Gardi	Gardizi
301	11 „ above	14	1½
312	1 „ „	Aboi	Ahol
315	fn. no. 255	VII. 16	VII. 81
330	14 from above	weapon	wooden
331	7 „ „	Kabateś	Kapateś
337	6 „ „	1638	1688
343	9 „ „	does	does not
350	fn. no. 42	110-133	119-133
351	fn. no. 85	628	682
351	fn. no. 100	1706	2706.





लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय  
Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Library

## मसूरी

**MUSSOORIE**

115769

यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।

**This book is to be returned on the date last stamped.**

[illegible]

954.02  
Maz

115767  
अवाप्ति संख्या

Acc No. 7797

वर्ग संख्या  
Class No. \_\_\_\_\_

पुस्तक संख्या  
Book No. \_\_\_\_\_

लेखक

Author Mazumdar.

शीर्षक

Title Socio-economic history  
of Northern India : 1030-

954.02

Maz

LIBRARY

LAL BHADUR SHASTRI

National Academy of Administration

MUSSOORIE

Accession No. \_\_\_\_\_

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced.